Vol. II. BOSTON, JULY, 1889. No. 7.

"Our part is to conspire with the new works of new days."---Emerson.

THE NEW IDEAL

A Journal of Constructive Liberal Thought and Applied Ethics.

Monthly, $2.00 a Year.

"*A glory shines before me of what mankind shall be,—*
Pure, generous, brave and free."—WHITTIER.

Single Copy, 20 Cts.

CONTENTS.

REPORT OF THE FREE RELIGIOUS ASSOCIATION CONVENTION—
Convention Notes, ... 97
The Business Meeting, ... 97
Letter from the President, ... *Wm. J. Potter* 97
Officers for the year 1888–1889, ... 98
Morning Session: Opening Address, ... *Col. T. W. Higginson* 98
Religious Instruction and the Public Schools, *M. J. Savage* 99
Sectarianism and the Public Schools, .. *Rev. J. W. Hamilton* 104
Religion in the Schools, ... *Mrs. E. D. Cheney* 106
Catholicism and the Public Schools, ... *Rev. Dr. McGlynn* 107
Afternoon Session: Opening Address, ... *Col. Higginson* 111
Nationalism, ... *Edward Bellamy* 112
Christian Socialism, ... *Rev. W. D. P. Bliss* 116
Individualism, ... *Wm. Lloyd Garrison* 119
Profit Sharing, ... *Rev. N. P. Gilman* 121
The Commonwealth of Man, ... *Rev. F. A. Hinckley* 123
The Festival: Introduction of the Chairman, .. *D. G. Crandon* 125
The Function of the State, ... *Edwin D. Mead* 125
Nationalism, ... *Mrs. Abby Morton Diaz* 127
Remarks by *Mrs. E. D. Cheney and others*, ... 127
NOTES—
What Shall Come of it All? Shall it All end in Words? Mr. Savage's Address; Mr. Mead's Outspoken Word; In our Next Issue; *The Modern Science Essayist;* "Trinity Church Exemption," ... 127
CORRESPONDENCE—
The Economic Question, ... *F. Harmer* 128

Says a subscriber to THE NEW IDEAL,—a thinker, and one competent to speak: "*I do not hesitate to pronounce it the best production of its kind that has ever appeared in this country.*" The above from New Jersey;—and the following word is from Florida: "*What I see in your special way of taking hold of the matter is, that you will draw Liberals together—you will help them to know and appreciate each other better.*"

WHAT "THE NEW IDEAL" NEEDS.

THAT all friends of Social Reform and Religious Progress should recognize that, in the present age of the world, a paper like THE NEW IDEAL cannot expect to receive a large voluntary subscription patronage.

THAT all friends of Progressive Thought and Social Endeavor, receiving this number of the paper and interested in its contents, should *themselves, at once,* become regular subscribers and permanent helpers in its publication.

THAT every present subscriber should show interest enough in its continuance to secure at least one new subscriber, for a year, at the $2.00 rates. (Your personal word only is needed, to secure such.)

THAT those *especially* interested in its work, who acknowledge "the great need of such a publication," and who recognize "the large value and influence of the paper thus far," should *especially* endeavor some generous and disinterested movement for its support and increased influence.

THAT those who "recognize its great value" and who would be "dismayed to see it discontinued," should understand that it cannot be continued indefinitely unless they help.

THAT the friends of the paper should appreciate that there is at present no organized movement looking to its support, but that there ought to be such at once.

THAT some one interested should take the initiative, and by a generous subscription start a permanent Publishing Fund.

THAT those not able to give largely should subscribe what they can, that all may, to some amount, be personally helpers.

Presented
By the Estate of
FRANCIS E. ABBOT.

[*Entered at the Post-office, Boston, for passage in the mails at second-class postal rates.*]

THE NEW IDEAL.

CONTENTS FOR JANUARY.

EDITORIAL—
Verses: Evolution: Alpha and Omega, . . 3
General Topics: Perfected Iconoclasm; The Permanent and the Important; Something Liberals must Give Up; "Practical Religion"; Word from Mr. Spencer; The Tables Turned; Toleration; Attack, ... 3
Our New Endeavor, ... 4

ESSAY—
Creative Liberalism, Francis E. Abbot, Ph.D 5

GENERAL CONTRIBUTIONS—
The New Ideal in Religion, Wm. J. Potter 6
The First and Great Commandment, F. A. Hinckley 7
The Need of the Hour, O. B. Frothingham 7
The Exile: *A Song*, . . F. M. Holland 8
The Squire in "Robert Elsmere," Moncure D. Conway 8
The Ideal Liberal Church, Dr. Lewis G. Janes 9
Religion in the Public Schools, Mrs. E. D. Cheney 10
For the Party's Sake, . Horace L. Traubel 10
"Pure Religion," . . . Perry Marshall 11
"Robert Elsmere," . . . F. M. Holland 12

CORRESPONDENCE—
Sentences from Recent Letters to THE NEW IDEAL: Underwood, Holland, Potter, Abbot, Blake, Mrs. Cheney, Janes, Simmons, Whipple, Gannett, Mead, Ball, Chadwick, Mills, Talbot, Weston, Traubel, Garrison, Learned, Salter, Buckley, Connor, Adams, . . 12-13

BOOK REVIEWS—
"The Law of Equivalents," "Show us the Father," "The Critical Period of American History," Pamphlet of The Brooklyn Ethical Association, ... 13-14

NOTES—Ethical Culture Convention, etc., etc., 14

CONTENTS FOR FEBRUARY.

EDITORIAL—
Verses: The Transcendent Possibility, . . 19
General Topics: Subscriptions Needed; a Popular Free-thinking Rabbi; "The Philosophy of Free Religion"; Missionary Fervor; The Brooklyn Evolution Essays; Mr. Underwood in the Field; What shall Liberals do with their Children? a Man among Men; the Ethics of Mr. Spencer's Philosophy, ... 19
"Agnosticism," 20

ESSAY—
Politics and Morals, . . Geo. W. Buckley 21

GENERAL CONTRIBUTIONS—
Something Better, . . Robt. C. Adams 24
Lucifer's Umbrella, Part I., Fred May Holland 25
Expectation: *Poem*, . . Andrew Oborne 26
The Dependence of Ethics, F. E. Abbot, Ph.D 26
Darwin: *Poem*, . Geo. Edgar Montgomery 27
A Japanese Patriot, . . . S. B. Weston 27
Prospect vs. Retrospect, Edward B. Payne 29
Agnosticism and Religion, . . A. N. Adams 29
Who Condemned Jesus to Death? F. M. Holland 30

CORRESPONDENCE—
Sentences from Recent Letters to THE NEW IDEAL: W. J. Potter, H. L. Traubel, Dr. F. E. Abbot, Capt. R. C. Adams, Dr. W. T. Harris, Carl H. Horsch, O. B. Frothingham, Dr. Edmund Montgomery, ... 30

ANNOUNCEMENTS—In our Next Issue, etc., . 18

[From FREDERIC MAY HOLLAND.]

"I think the paper will really fill a need."

[From FREDERIC A. HINCKLEY, Florence, Mass.]

"I am well pleased. To begin with, it looks wholesome, and that is much. Then I like the word from Emerson and the word from Whittier. Also your own phrase, 'Constructive Liberal Thought and Applied Eth-Ethics.' I will call attention to it publicly and privately."

Sample Copy.

Any one receiving this paper, not having ordered it, receives it as a Sample Copy, free, but is cordially invited to subscribe.

The paper cannot be sent continuously to any but regular subscribers.

Any subscriber wishing the address on his paper changed must give the old as well as the new address, or the change cannot be made. *Please do not send local checks.*

CONTENTS FOR MARCH.

EDITORIAL—
Verses: "Prepared," 35
General Topics: What shall Liberals do with their Children? Sunday Laws in California; The Important Word; The Philadelphia Ethical Convention; Truth-Seeking; Mr. Potter's Historical Pamphlet; "The Century of Foreign Missions"; Cosmian Ideals; Biblical Walnut-Meats and Shells; The Infinitude of Agnosticism! The Brooklyn Evolution Essays; In Our Next Issue; "The Name God," 35

ESSAY—
The Papacy, . . Hon. George F. Talbot 36

GENERAL CONTRIBUTIONS—
Theory and Conduct, . O. B. Frothingham 38
Solution: *Poem*, . . Horace L. Traubel 39
"What shall Liberals do with their Children?" Dr. C. T. Stockwell 39
"What shall Liberals do with their Children?" Susan H. Wixon 40
The New Ideal: *Poem*, . . T. W. Curtis 41
The Philosophy of Free Religion, I., F. E. Abbot, Ph.D 41
Lucifer's Umbrella, Part II., Fred May Holland 42
Child-Culture, . . . Wm. G. Babcock 43
"Who Condemned Jesus to Death?" E. C. F. Krauss 44
Testimony the Basis of History, Charles K. Whipple 45

BOOK REVIEWS—
"The Coming Creed of the World," "God and Man," "Girard's Will and Girard College Theology," 46
Periodicals: "The Kindergarten," "The Freethinkers' Magazine," "Fair Play," etc., . . 47

NOTES—Mrs. Underwood's New Work; Blue Religion in Boston; Mr. Salter at the Liberal Union Club; Mr. Underwood still a Missionary, etc., etc., ... 47

CONTENTS FOR APRIL.

EDITORIAL—
Verses: The New "Christ," 51
General Topics: Jottings on Liberalism; Why not Recognize it? Church Taxation in Oregon; Not a Leg to Stand on; Christianity and Liberalism; The Ladder of Rationalism; Christianity and Buddhism; Out of the Spectrum the White Ray; The Growth of Man; The World's Grandest Idea and Grandest Epoch; Order vs. Miracle, ... 51

ESSAY—
Has Morality an Evolutional or an Eternal Basis? . . Dr. Edmund Montgomery 53

GENERAL CONTRIBUTIONS—
The Philosophic Spirit vs. Egotism, Sara A. Underwood 54
The Evolution of the Earth, Lewis G. Janes 55
Women and Science, . Elissa M. Moore 56
Isolation: *Poem*, Mary Morgan (Gowan Lea) 57
The Philosophy of Free Religion, II., F. E. Abbot, Ph.D 57
What shall Liberals do with their Children? Alice L. Darlington 59
Children's Sundays, . . M. Emily Adams 59
Heart-Wood: *Poem*, ... S. E. C. 60
Notes on the Recent Ethical Convention, Horace L. Traubel 60
A Word about Agnosticism, O. B. Frothingham 61
Lucifer's Umbrella. Part III., Fred. May Holland 62

NOTES—Mr. Underwood's Activity; A Broader and Deeper Unity; *The Ethical Record;* What shall Liberals do with their Children? etc., etc., ... 63

You should not miss these books.

ETHICS OF RELIGION.

The Spencer-Harrison Controversy.

THE INSUPPRESSIBLE BOOK. A reprint of the controversy between Herbert Spencer and Frederick Harrison on the Nature and Reality of Religion. With new notes by GAIL HAMILTON. 1 vol., 12mo, cloth, $1.50.

Modern Liberal Judaism.

MESSIANIC EXPECTATIONS AND MODERN JUDAISM. By RABBI SOLOMON SCHINDLER. A most learned discourse on the subject. A complete historical treatment of what the Jewish faith means. 2d edition. 12mo, cloth, $1.50.

*** *Above books to be had of all first-class booksellers. Catalogue of standard and scientific publications sent on application to the publisher.*

Bradlee Whidden,

41 ARCH STREET, BOSTON, MASS.

CONTENTS FOR MAY.

EDITORIAL—
Verses: Star and Cross, ... 67
General Topics: Jottings; Stand Forth! With a Rope of Sand; Heathen Philanthropy; A Conspiracy for Good; For Social Favor and Business' Sake; The Free Religious Society at Providence; *The Modern Science Essayist;* The Present Work of Rationalism; Are they Convertible Terms? What Good? Universalist Deification of Jesus; The Way of the World, ... 67

ESSAY—
Freethought and Ethics, Mrs. Clara M. Bisbee 69

GENERAL CONTRIBUTIONS—
The Freedom of Fate, . Ellen M. Mitchell 70
Supernatural Ethics Irrational and Immoral, Dr. Edmund Montgomery 71
Brave art Thou in Another's Speech: *Poem*, Horace L. Traubel 72
Wasson's Essays, . . Mrs. E. D. Cheney 72
Justice and Taxes, . . . F. M. Holland 73
The Philosophy of Free Religion, III., F. E. Abbot, Ph.D 74
A Word from an Agnostic, J. A. J. Wilcox 75
Science the Best Teacher of Liberalism, Geo. H. Hadley 76
At Heaven's Gate: *Poem*, . . . M. A. 76
The Evolution of Religion, . Perry Marshall 77
To Cheapen or to Honor Fame, Horace L. Traubel 77

BOOK REVIEWS—
"Our Heredity from God"; "The Tree of Mythology"; "Looking Backward"; "The Insuppressible Book"; "The Reign of the Stoics"; Notes, etc., ... 78

CONTENTS FOR JUNE.

EDITORIAL—
General Topics: THE NEW IDEAL's Enlargement; True Worship; Gods and Men; The Old Cry and the New; What Men Need; Addresses by Theodore Parker Wanted; To See and Do; The Free Religious Association Anniversary; The Editor to his Visitors; All the World; Agnosticism as a Working Force; Monthly or Fortnightly; Trinity Church Exemption, ... 81

ESSAY—
"Social Conditions and Tendencies," B. F. Underwood 82

GENERAL CONTRIBUTIONS—
Romanism and American Liberty, B. W. Ball 83
A Monument to All Religions, F. M. Holland 84
Intellectual Dishonesty, Charles K. Whipple 85
Sweet Prattling Child: *Poem*, H. L. Traubel 86
The Philosophy of Free Religion, IV., F. E. Abbot, Ph.D 86
Hospitals not Creations of Christianity, M. Emily Adams 88
Fatalistic Science and Human Self-Determination, . . . Dr. Edm. Montgomery 89
Absent, Ever Present: *Poem*, Andrew Oborne 91
The Fundamentals, . . . Perry Marshall 91
A Vision, I., ... Elissa M. Moore 91
A Study of Religion and Science, I., A. N. Adams 92

SELECTED—
History of the Free Religious Association, O. B. Frothingham 93

BOOK NOTES—
"Pioneer Pith," "Profit Sharing," etc., . . 96

HERBERT SPENCER: His life, writings, and philosophy. 10 Cts. New Ideal Pub. Co., Boston.

The first of a series of Liberal Religious "Tracts."

New Ideal Leaflets.--No. 1.

SOMETHING BETTER.

(Better than "Christianity.")

By CAPT. ROBERT C. ADAMS.

SINGLE COPY, 2 CTS; ONE DOZEN, 10 CTS; 100, 60 CTS.

Suitable for slipping in a letter.

One subscriber to THE NEW IDEAL has already ordered 500 copies.

*** Sent postpaid, on receipt of price, by THE NEW IDEAL COMPANY, 620 Atlantic Ave., Boston.

CHARLES DARWIN: His life, works, and influence. 10 Cts. New Ideal Pub. Co., Boston.

[From Dr. EDMUND MONTGOMERY.]

"In contributing to THE NEW IDEAL I shall feel that I am striving for a lofty purpose in company with high-minded fellow-workers. . . The great service you are rendering to free Ethics and free Religion."

Vol. II. BOSTON, JULY, 1889. No. 7.

"Our part is to conspire with the new works of new days."---Emerson.

THE NEW IDEAL

A Journal of Constructive Liberal Thought and Applied Ethics.

Monthly, $2.00 a Year.

"A glory shines before me of what mankind shall be,—
Pure, generous, brave and free."—WHITTIER.

Single Copy, 20 Cts.

THE NEW IDEAL.

JAMES H. WEST, ... Editor.

Publication Office,
HATHAWAY BUILDING, 620 Atlantic Avenue,
BOSTON, MASS.

CONTRIBUTORS.

WM. J. POTTER, B. F. UNDERWOOD, FRANCIS E. ABBOT, PH.D.,
EDWIN D. MEAD, FRED. MAY HOLLAND, B. W. BALL,
O. B. FROTHINGHAM, HORACE L. TRAUBEL, MRS. EDNAH D. CHENEY,
DR. LEWIS G. JANES, CHARLES K. WHIPPLE, E. P. POWELL,
CHAS. D. B. MILLS, ELISSA M. MOORE, HON. GEO. F. TALBOT,
WM. M. SALTER, CAPT. ROBERT C. ADAMS, ROWLAND CONNOR,
MONCURE D. CONWAY, GEO. W. BUCKLEY, MRS. S. A. UNDERWOOD,
S. BURNS WESTON, PERRY MARSHALL, M. J. SAVAGE,
DR. C. T. STOCKWELL, FREDERIC A. HINCKLEY, DR. EDM. MONTGOMERY.

The Object of "The New Ideal."

THE object of THE NEW IDEAL is the discovery and propagation of constructive liberal thought, and the application of modern ethical ideals to the increasing problems of human need. This work it will deem Religion. It will feel, moreover, that there is no religion higher or more necessary; for this, on its thought side, will be the establishing of ethics and religion on a scientific basis,—a consummation which a rapidly increasing number of the world's earnest workers are more and more, every year now, demanding and endeavoring; and on its practical side it will be the augmenting of the sum of human good.

The actual needs of mankind in the present day are so widely different, in many ways, from mankind's supposed needs in the past; the changed basis of modern knowledge from the basis of older systems is so complete; to those who are able to see there is so much more of beauty and helpfulness in the New and nearer True than in the still prevalent religious fantasies of the child-world, that the editor deems there will be place and room for the paper. And with the unsurpassed list of contributors which he is able to print elsewhere, he is confident THE NEW IDEAL will never lack either in interest or value.

A word concerning our title-phrase: Mankind's old ideal was a supposed supernatural revelation; the authority of tradition and creed; a life in accord with speculative dogma. The New Ideal, as mankind is slowly coming to comprehend and formulate it, is a naturally acquired knowledge; the authority of the nature of things; a life in harmony with the universe's highest discoverable energies. Our title thus hints forcibly, and in three words, the whole high basis of the world's modern nobler thought and activity.

CONVENTION NOTES.

THAT THE NEW IDEAL gives so much space in this issue to the Report of the recent Convention of the Free Religious Association will, we know, be a matter of self-congratulation to all our readers. The topics discussed were "our" topics — "live" topics — topics of the Time Now.

FRIENDS and members alike feel that the emphatic words of the absent President, in his letter of greeting, in regard to the continued use and need of such an Association as ours, are abundantly made good and newly demonstrated by the large public interest in our cause.

ALL the meetings of the Association this year have been attended by very large audiences.

COMPLETE REPORT OF THE

TWENTY-SECOND ANNUAL CONVENTION

OF THE

FREE RELIGIOUS ASSOCIATION.

THE BUSINESS MEETING.

THE Business Meeting of the Free Religious Association of America, for the hearing of reports, election of officers, etc., was held in Social Hall, Tremont Temple, Boston, Thursday, May 30, at 7.45 P.M.

In the absence of the President, Secretary D. G. Crandon called the meeting to order, and, after reading the call for the meeting, requested Director John L. Whiting, of Boston, to preside. Then followed the reading of the Records, and the Report of the Treasurer, John C. Haynes, by which it appeared there was a balance of $131.75 in the Treasury.

The Secretary then read the following

LETTER FROM PRESIDENT WM. J. POTTER.

ATLANTIC CITY, N. J., May 28, 1889.

Dear Friends and Fellow-Members
of the Free Religious Association:

IN lieu of my personal presence, I must send you this year by letter my earnest fraternal greetings. For the second time only in the twenty-two years since the Free Religious Association was organized, I am to be absent from one of its Conventions. This is not occasioned by any failure of interest in the Association, but by the failure of the necessary physical conditions. Yet I am glad to say that I am as well able to participate actively in the meetings of this year as I was to take part in those of the two immediately preceding years. But now I have decided that it is the part of discretion to pay stricter heed than I did then to the injunctions of my physician against my engaging in such public duties.

As concerns my relation to the Association, my greatest anxiety is lest my enforced inactivity has been, to a considerable extent, the cause of the Association's inactivity for the past year or two. The President of our organization needs to be in the full vigor of health. I have accordingly intimated to the Nominating Committee my desire that they would find some one to take my place as President who would be able to discharge all the duties of the office. I have the interests of the Association too much at heart, and have too deep a faith in its still possible usefulness, to permit any disability of mine to stand for a moment in the way of new activities that might be taken up under a new and efficient officer-in-chief.

But, though the Association has had an inactive year, it may congratulate itself that the principles for which it stands are spreading and enlisting the sympathies of thoughtful people as never before. It is sometimes said, indeed, that our work as an Association is now being done elsewhere. So far as this is true we may be grateful for

the fact, and rejoice in the work, by whomsoever done,— whether by radical Unitarians, or by Ethical Culture Societies, or by Independents, or by liberal Orthodox and Episcopalians,— as *our work*. The statement, however, is not yet true to such an extent that the Free Religious Association can afford to disband. This general free rational movement of the time, while we are duly thankful for it, is yet much hampered by irrational ecclesiastical entanglements and traditions. The axe is not yet laid, with close, uncompromising logic, at the root of ecclesiastical authority. There is therefore still an abundant field for the Free Religious Association,— of which the originating and fundamental motive-principle (in my opinion) is the rightful and complete authority of human reason in religion, as opposed to all ecclesiastical claims of super-natural authority, whether such authority be vested in a book, a priesthood, a creed, a church, a tradition, or the alleged miraculous founder of a religion. From this central principle have come, by logical implication as corollaries, those other aspects of the Association which have given significance to its work, and have sometimes been regarded as its chief functions; namely, its tracing, in the spirit of a scientific study of history, the various religions to a common root; its emphasis of "the sympathy of religions"; its anti-sectarian attitude; its efforts to bring together on the same platform, in amicable discussion, the representatives of various churches and beliefs. All these, and other forms of expression and action, have been only different but harmonious features of the same central truth, that *Human Intelligence, using the natural tests given in itself, is the rightful criterion of all religious knowledge for man.* The time, surely, is not ended when an organization, specially pledged to work on the lines of this truth, is needed.

Two occurrences in line with this truth, within the past year, come to my mind as deserving particular recognition from the friends and members of the Free Religious Association. One is the establishment in Boston of THE NEW IDEAL,— a journal so nearly like *The Index* in method and spirit, as well as in the *personnel* of its contributors, that it may almost be called a resuscitation of that paper. The courage, ability, and self-sacrificing earnestness with which Mr. James H. West, almost single-handed, has inaugurated this new publication, should be remembered among the chief reasons for rejoicing at this annual gathering. May his work be strengthened not only by helpful words, but by many additions to his subscription-list.

The other occurrence is the effort, made public at a Conference in Philadelphia last January called by the Ethical Culture Societies, for the founding of a "School of Philosophy and Applied Ethics." This enterprise is one of such magnitude and importance that it will necessarily move slowly. The aim is to found a School where the instruction shall combine the utmost freedom of thought with the highest learning. And the object of the School is to be the training of public teachers of ethics and religion, and of practical workers in the varied domain of philanthropy and charity. As one who attended the Philadelphia Conference and became conversant with the spirit and purposes of those who have projected this enterprise, I can most earnestly commend it to the attention and help of all the friends of a free and humanitarian religion.

With the best of wishes for this the Twenty-Second Annual Meeting of the Free Religious Association, I am

Your friend and coadjutor,

WM. J. POTTER.

After some discussion of the contents of the letter, it was generally agreed that Mr. Potter could not be spared from the Presidency this year. The Nominating Committee for officers of the Association for 1889–1890 then reported through their Chairman, Mr. Geo. W. Stevens, the following list being presented. And the persons named were thereupon unanimously elected.

Officers for the Year 1889–1890.

PRESIDENT.
WILLIAM J. POTTER, New Bedford, Mass.

VICE-PRESIDENTS.
OCTAVIUS B. FROTHINGHAM, Boston, Mass.
FELIX ADLER, New York City.
GEORGE WM. CURTIS, Staten Island, N. Y.
THOMAS WENTWORTH HIGGINSON, Cambridge, Mass.
ELIZABETH B. CHACE, Providence, R. I.
GEORGE HOADLY, Cincinnati, O.
NATHANIEL HOLMES, Cambridge, Mass.
FREDERICK DOUGLASS, Washington, D. C.
SOLOMON SCHINDLER, Boston, Mass.
EDNAH D. CHENEY, Jamaica Plain, Mass.
EDMUND MONTGOMERY, Hempstead, Texas.
MONCURE D. CONWAY, New York City.

SECRETARY.
EDWIN D. MEAD, Boston, Mass.

ASSISTANT-SECRETARY.
D. G. CRANDON, Chelsea, Mass.

TREASURER.
JOHN C. HAYNES, 451 Washington Street, Boston, Mass.

DIRECTORS — Four years.
JOHN WILSON, Cambridge, Mass.
A. G. HILL, Florence, Mass.
JAMES H. WEST, Boston, Mass.

THREE YEARS.
JOHN CURTIS, Boston, Mass.
MRS. REBECCA WILCOX, Chelsea, Mass.
B. A. BALLOU, Providence, R. I.

TWO YEARS.
EDWIN D. MEAD, Boston, Mass.
MISS HELEN M. IRESON, Lynn, Mass.
PROF. THOMAS DAVIDSON, Orange, N. J.

ONE YEAR.
JOHN L. WHITING, Boston, Mass.
MRS. ANNA D. HALLOWELL, West Medford, Mass.
JOHN W. CHADWICK, Brooklyn, N. Y.

THE CONVENTION.

OPENING ADDRESS OF COL. T. W. HIGGINSON.

Members of the Free Religious Association, and Ladies and Gentlemen:

ON account of the continued illness and consequent absence of the President of the Association, and of the absence from this vicinity of the senior Vice-Presidents, I have been called upon to preside at this meeting. I think it a felicitous arrangement by which the Free Religious Association selected Friday of Anniversary Week as its day of meeting. We do, therefore, for Anniversary Week, what our kindred spirits, the Bedouins and Cossacks of the eastern armies, did for themselves,— we not only precede the approach, but if necessary we cover the retreat. We come here with tired voices but untired spirits, to sum up in an hour what has been done during the last few days; to recognize the services of all the other bodies that have met this week, and, with that self-confidence which Mr. Emerson says is necessary to any good man, to go away with an impression that, on the whole, our organization and our work are the most important.

We meet here in the old spirit, at the old place,— old for us at least in our little lifetime as an organization,— to renew the old assurances, and the old mutual pledges of friendship. We have seen the thoughts that we first brought forward gradually become more acceptable to the community, and taken up so effectually in some cases, by other bodies, that they have utterly forgotten that they did not originate them. A brilliant English woman, who was

very plain in person, used to say of herself, after a certain period of life, that she had begun to hope that the bloom of her ugliness had passed by. The bloom of our ugliness has faded. We are now sometimes criticized as being a little too respectable, by those who have recently introduced as respectability what once was radicalism with us. Who cannot recall those early meetings when we were criticized for our talk about the sympathy of religions? And yet great religious bodies now send missionaries among the Buddhists, to meet them on common ground and recognize whatever of sympathy they find in Buddhist doctrines with Christianity at home. Who doesn't remember the time when we were criticized for having Jews, and Brahmins if we could get them, upon our platform? The Jews and Brahmins now are tempted to pass us by, because, through our example, they have been introduced into better company than we can offer. Steadily we have seen the thoughts which were once our heresies become almost the conservatism of others. Our treatment of the texts of scripture, our treatment of the basis of religious union, are less important from our lips, because the same treatment is beginning to be heard from the lips of Christians everywhere. And if our movement attracts less attention in some quarters than formerly, it is simply because there is a whole army marching on through those passes and defiles where at first our bayonets were the only ones that gleamed. Everywhere in the religious world we see the impression of thoughts of which we will not say that we created them, but that we happened to speak them first. And all the absence of a great, demonstrative, glittering organization, the absence of special churches scattered over the land here and there, the absence of vast instrumentalities for raising money,—all these things are secondary matters to us, so long as this body can still work for that spirit of freedom which was its first word, and which will be its last word.

And yet we are perhaps not like the Bedouins alone; we might also be compared with those men I saw straying along by ones and twos as I came in on the cars this morning, along the lines of telegraph and telephone poles; those little groups of men who spend their lives wandering about, one or two of them together, with their wires in their hands, and their spiked shoes, ready to work on the poles above the heads of common men of the world, who yet feel the benefits of what they have done. Their lives seem to us a little bit lonely. We don't know where they come from, we don't know where they live; for all we know, they dine on the top of the poles, and sleep stretched along the wires. They spend their lonely lives, the one perched on his pole, his neighbor perched beyond speaking distance on the next. It seems a life of busy idleness to the steady laborers by the roadside. But, after all, it is to those men that the world owes the first glimpses of its passing intelligence. And the light that by night lights up the darkened places of the city,—that light is theirs.

So with us. We go on our different work, lonely if you please; but in the loneliness of a sympathy that is none the less real because it has sometimes to wait a generation or two to find its recognition.

I am glad, for one, that we have come back, in the last two or three years, to this hall, our birthplace, and always our natural home. To those of us who look back to the early days of our meetings, this hall is filled with noble and sainted images. Never was there a nobler set of men and women than those whose forms and faces still people these seats and this platform. The serene presence of Alcott; the *lumen siccum* or dry light of Emerson's presence; the motherly loveliness of Lucretia Mott; the pure spirit of William Henry Channing; the kindly, canny, Scotch countenance of Robert Dale Owen; the noble head and luminous eyes of Wasson; the Semitic beauty of John Weiss, who was once described as a man one part flesh and three parts fire,—these rise before us; and our only consolation in their departure is the fact that their work renews itself; the contribution of to-day may be as good as the earlier, although that is seen through the picturesque perspective of the distant past.

In regard to the order of the questions at this Convention, the order of the speakers, the method of the present meeting, the Chairman has an easy task. He has abundant resources at his disposal. We have sometimes been reproached with talking too much at these meetings. We have very seldom been reproached with having too few people, or talking too little. There was a story the other day of the father of a family who appeared rather anxious at the breakfast-table, and his little boy asked him what the trouble was. He said, "I have something on my mind." "What is it?" asked the boy. "I have got to engineer a public meeting," said the father. "Why," said the boy, "I should think it would be the easiest thing in the world, father, to engineer a public meeting. All you have to do is just turn on the cranks." [*Laughter.*]

We cannot, perhaps, give you to-day such a variety of opinion as at that first Convention, concerning which an anxious young Andover student wrote to the *Springfield Republican*, the next day, that he had been to the meeting and had heard the word religion used in five different senses. We can't give so great a variety as that, but we can give quite enough, perhaps, to satisfy you. The subject of this morning will be one of the immediate subjects which concern all citizens, especially in this vicinity where the matter has been discussed so much,—The Relation of Religious Instruction to the Public Schools. This afternoon we shall take up the great question of practical life in this age,—the question of social reform, presented to us under the title of Nationalism or Socialism, and led off by a man whose words have been a trumpet-blast on that subject, Mr. Edward Bellamy.

This morning we deal with the other subject which I indicated. The subject is one on which the Chairman, who reserves the privilege of saying a word or two before we adjourn if there is a chance for him, will refrain heroically from speaking at present, from a fear of prejudicing his sense of justice as Chairman of the meeting. Understand, if you please, that, until my time comes to speak, it is a subject on which I have absolutely no opinions. I shall now have the honor to introduce to you, as the first speaker on the subject, the Rev. Minot J. Savage.

ADDRESS OF REV. M. J. SAVAGE.

Mr. Chairman, and Ladies and Gentlemen:

Before beginning the discussion of the theme that is assigned to me, perhaps I may be pardoned just one word of personal reminiscence, called to mind by the opening remarks of our Chairman. I have not reckoned just how many years ago it was; but I remember that one morning I sat in the gallery here, a good many years ago, when I was an Orthodox minister, and listened to one of the most stirring, one of the most finished, one of the most beautiful addresses I ever heard from any man, from the lips of O. B. Frothingham. Of course I did not then believe one word of it, but I was stirred and thrilled and lifted by his spiritual power. I don't know that I can trace any particular results in my life to that discourse; I am not quite sure that he contributed anything in the way of accelerating the growth that was then going on in my mind; but I remember it with joy to-day, and I wish that his face were here this morning on this platform.

A word also as to the office of the Free Religious Association in making heretical ideas palatable to other minds.

I was reminded, by what the Chairman said, of a remark made to me by Colonel Ingersoll, two or three years ago. I met him in New York, and we naturally touched on some of the religious questions of the day; and he said, in his frank, brusque, humorous way, "Savage, you ought to be perpetually grateful to me. I make you respectable. No matter what you say, people can always add that it isn't half as bad as that Ingersoll, anyhow." So under cover of the leadership of the Free Religious Association, the other religious bodies of the land can make their advance, feeling that the lightning of popular indignation, if it is going to strike anywhere, always strikes the highest point, so that it will hit this body instead of theirs.

Pardon these words that do not touch my theme, and now go with me while I ask your attention for a little while to the topic of the morning,—The Relation of Religious Instruction to the Public Schools.

There is always some special incident that marks the crisis of popular thought which starts a movement of public importance; and yet this incident is never the cause. It was the firing on Fort Sumter which precipitated the war, but it was not the firing on Fort Sumter that caused it. The causes lay back of that, and were at least a hundred years old. This was only the incident which precipitated a result which had been long in preparation. So when one of the Catholic priests of this city criticized the methods of teaching on the part of one of our teachers in the public schools; and when, as a result of that, this teacher was transferred, and, as another result, there was a change in one of our text-books, this was not the cause of the crisis which has been precipitated upon us; it was only one of the results — an incident which precipitated the immediate discussion. Nobody is to blame for the fact that this question is up, and needs to be settled. The Catholics are not to blame; the Evangelical Protestants are not to blame; the Unitarians are not to blame; the scientific men who have been teaching us new ideas of the universe, and the leaders of religious thought who have been giving us new conceptions of God and of our relation to him, are not to blame for this fact. It was inevitable, as one of the results of the growth of thought and life in this country. I wish, then, to ask you to go back with me a few moments, and consider how very necessary it was that we should come to our present pass.

When the Puritans and the Pilgrims came over to this country and colonized Massachusetts, they were a small body, but a very earnest and devoted one; and they were homogeneous in blood, homogeneous in their political ideas, homogeneous in their religious thought. They had no idea of any conflict or separation between the functions of the church and State. The church and the State with them were just as much one as they had been in England, or as they had ever been under the dominating power of the Catholic church itself. No one but a church-member could vote, so that church-membership and citizenship were identical.

And we must remember another thing: they considered this life as of very slight relative importance. It was only a prelude to that eternal life which lay beyond. This was only a sort of probationary period they were passing through, a training-school from which they were speedily to graduate, and to graduate to everlasting glory or eternal shame. And with that belief firmly grounded in their minds, having, as they supposed, the highest substantial basis for holding it, we cannot wonder that they looked at life as they did. Old Jonathan Edwards was right, from that point of view, in speaking of the whole career of life here on earth as only the history of Redemption. The one thing which was uppermost, and rightly uppermost, in their minds, was the question as to the salvation of their souls. Put yourselves for a moment into their places,—for the basis of all justice is simply the ability to understand the point of view of the persons with whom we are dealing. They believed that the one grand object and end of human life was to get ready to die. It was perfectly natural, then, for them to feel that the public schools should be made the very foremost instrument in religious educational training. Such a thought as separating the school from religion was no more conceivable on their part than of separating their souls from religion. They showed — what we should look upon with sympathy instead of with condemnation — such a faith in popular education as led them to do what the world had never done so grandly before — make the finest provision for the establishment of public schools. But of course, as I said, it never occurred to them that there could be any separation between the teaching of religion and the teaching of other subjects which they regarded of importance.

After the Revolution, however, when we came to be a nation among the nations of the world, what did we do? Without thinking, perhaps, of the effect that was going to be produced in some departments of life and thought, we threw down every wall, we opened every door, and invited the people of all nations, all tongues, all religions, freely to our shores. We asked them to come and share with us in our natural resources, to share with us in our means of education, to share with us all the rights and grand privileges of our citizenship. And they took us at our word, and came. Who came? Why, Roman Catholics came, members of the Church of England came, Quakers came, Baptists came, Buddhists came, followers of Confucius came, Jews came, Hindus came; people from all over the world took us at our word and came, expecting that we would be true to our word and give them the same equal rights of citizenship as we enjoyed ourselves.

It was not strange, I suppose, that at first these old Puritans and Pilgrims, or their descendents, should be a little shocked at the result of their possibly too hospitable invitation. It has been sarcastically said of them that they came here to worship God according to the dictates of their own consciences, and to compel everybody else to do the same. It was not surprising if at first they should attempt this, for they were men in dead earnest, who believed that this was the only right way to worship God; and at that time in the history of the world such a thing as universal religious toleration was almost unheard of. We ought to judge them from the point of view of their time, and not hold them too strictly responsible for failure in ideas which at that time had hardly been born.

But all these men came; and, as a result, it precipitated this problem, which has been continually growing. The question has been seething in the public mind for many long years, and at last it is up for settlement. We must face it, just as this country in the long years from '61 to '65 was compelled to face the great problems which were not settled by the fathers, and probably under the circumstances could not have been settled by them. So we must face this great problem of the relation of public schools to religious instruction, which has been preparing as a natural and necessary result of the growth of the last century.

Now how do we stand? I believe, and I think you will agree with me as you consider it, that it is the most cruel of all conceivable tyrannies to compel a parent to submit to such an education of his child as he believes means a personal danger to, and perhaps the certain eternal destruction of that child's soul. What are earthly considerations compared with that? A few years — ten, twenty, thirty, or perhaps sixty or seventy — here on earth, and then Forever! — and that Forever to be determined by these few years here. What difference does it make, to a man to whom

that Forever is a reality, as to how he passes these few preliminary years, provided only that be made secure?

I believe, then, that it is the worst species of tyranny conceivable, on the part of the State, to compel the instruction or education of children in such a way as, according to the sincere belief of parents, shall mean the destruction of their children's souls forever. So, if I were a Catholic, I would not submit to my child's going to the public schools as they have been managed in New England during the past twenty-five years. If I were a Catholic, I would bear any other domination rather than that. The causes which led to the Revolution are slight compared to it. The causes which led to the overturning of any government in the history of the world are as nothing compared with the interests involved in this to the Catholic, if he be sincere and true to the creed in which he has been trained. The one thing, then, that the State has no right to do is to compel the child of a Catholic, of a Jew, of a Buddhist, of a follower of Confucius, of a Unitarian, of an atheist, or of a man who does not share the belief, to submit to being taught, in even an indirect way, the fundamental principles of Evangelical Christianity.

Let us consider for a moment the basis of the public school, and see on what it rests, for what it exists, and therefore what its rights and limitations are. By what right does the public educate the children at all? Of course you are aware that there are large numbers of the most intelligent people in the world who are opposed to the method of wholesale public instruction, every way. They claim that the State has no right to take the work of the education of children out of the hands of the parents; that it is something that belongs peculiarly and exclusively to them. I do not, however, agree with them; and yet I should place the right of the State to educate on a basis which I have not seen very often referred to. I believe that the State has a right to establish and carry on a public-school system, just as it has a right to levy taxes; just as it has a right to compel its citizens to enter the army in a time of public danger; just as it has a right to suspend the writ of *Habeas Corpus* under certain conditions,—the right of public safety. That, and only that, it seems to me, gives the State the right to take money from all the people, and then compel all the people to submit their children to a certain definite kind of education at the public expense. It is the right of public safety. Under a king, under a despot, under a man who rules as does to-day the Czar of Russia, it might be perfectly safe to leave this matter of public education in the hands of the parents. For no matter whether the people are educated or not, if the Czar be strong, and if he be wise at the same time, there may be a strong and good government; because it doesn't depend on the education or the character of the people. But with us, the very safety, the very stability of the Republic, depends on what kind of citizens they are who hold the votes in their hands and determine not only the course of public opinion but the course of public action.

The State, then, it seems to me, has a right to do three things. If the people choose to submit to it, if it is in accord with the prevailing public will, if there is no serious objection on the part of anybody, then of course the State has a right to teach almost anything it pleases in the public schools; it has a right to organize an arrangement of that which reaches from the Primary School to Harvard, and to teach everything. But the few things that it seems to me we have a right to demand of the public school, as its essentials, are these: In the first place, the public welfare demands that every boy and girl shall be so trained that that boy and girl can earn an honest living. The very first and most important thing is that the children be so trained that they can earn a livelihood, and so not become a public burden. Now whether, in accordance with this idea, we shall introduce industrial education into the public schools, or whether we shall think that the best way is to elevate as high as possible the level of popular intelligence without any regard to the training of the hand or eye or ear, of course will depend on the opinion which prevails at any particular time. But no matter about that; lay that one side for a moment. The first thing of importance is that, in some way, we shall do the best we know how at any particular time to fit our children for self-support. Then what? The next thing is that we shall so educate them, give them such a kind and amount of education, as shall enable them to cast an intelligent ballot. The one great serious danger in our Republic, more even than its vice and its crime that need reforming, is its ignorance,—its ignorance of the past history of the world, its ignorance of those methods that have proved successes or failures in the past. For people are perpetually trying experiments, over and over again, that they would know could never succeed if they had only understood that, by frequent experiment, the question had been settled over and over, years and years ago. The second point is that the children should be so instructed that they can be intelligent citizens.

The third point, and one of chief importance to my mind, is that they should receive such ethical training as should enable them to comprehend clearly the rights and the duties of citizenship, so that if they go wrong it shall be a matter of personal perversity,—so that the public at any rate shall not be responsible for their going wrong.

This raises a question that I need to branch off and discuss for a moment. I suppose there are a great many people who will assert that it is simply impossible to teach ethics without teaching religion. To their minds the questions of right and wrong are so inextricably bound up and intertwined with questions of theology and religious opinion that it doesn't enter into their minds that the two can ever be separated. But if we go back, and trace the history of human thought and human life a little, it can be made perfectly clear to us that the two are separable in fact, and can be made quite separable in practice. The earliest religions of the world had nothing whatever to do with morality. The people looked upon themselves as dealing with certain invisible powers. The question of morality was no more necessary in the relation in which some barbarian man stood to his God, than the relation in which he stood to his king was to the question of the duties and rights of himself and his neighbors. He was simply afraid of this Power, was desirous of propitiating it and of gaining its favor and assistance, and it did not occur to him that this stood in any sort of relation to the relation of mutual help between man and man. Many and many a time the Gods themselves were not noted for their morality. The Gods of a people were frequently as immoral as were their kings; so that originally there was no sort of necessary connection between morality and religion. Morality sprang out of human relationships. The questions of justice and fair-dealing and kindliness arose from human helpfulness between man and man; and people learned to be just and moral as the result of experience, living together in society. After a time, indeed, morality and religion, following lines not quite parallel, yet converging lines, came nearer and nearer together; but there have been times in the history of the world, as in ancient Athens for instance, when for a man to be highly moral it was necessary for him to be irreligious. Socrates was irreligious, according to the dominant theories of his time; and he was so because he was compelled to be so by the light of his higher and grander ethical insight. And so here in Boston. We need not go back so far as the ancient Athens,—the modern one will do. Theodore Parker, according to the dominant religious views of his time, was

an irreligious man. He was an irreligious man judged from one point of view. And why? Because he had new and higher ideas, and because he felt the stress of his moral purpose so strongly that he was compelled to be true to it in spite of the religious judgment of his time.

Religion and morality, then, are quite separable in practice, as they have been in fact. But, of course, when we reach the time, if we ever do, of the complete and perfect development of both religion and ethics, then they will become identical; because it will be seen that the God of this universe is the living life and power in the universe, its constituent laws being the mere methods of his work, so that to do right and to obey God, or be religious, shall be one and the same thing. But up to the present time religion and morality are not identical, and they are sufficiently separable so that we can teach our children the fundamental principles of right and wrong without any regard to any narrow or sectarian conception of religion whatsoever. The principles of right and wrong have been discovered and developed as a result of human experience, just as surely as has any other knowledge in the history of the world; and I see no reason why a text-book of ethics should not be prepared that would teach our children clearly the rights and duties of citizenship, as clearly and as simply as we teach them the fundamental principles of mathematics or the great leading facts of human history.

There was a symposium in the *Christian Register*, not a great while ago, on this question of ethical instruction in the public schools. I don't know whether you, in analyzing it, came to the same conclusion that I did, but it seemed to me that the result of it was this: no one showed that it was impossible to teach the principles of right and wrong in the public schools. Where they diverged from each other, and came into conflict, was in the *philosophy* of ethics, concerning the religious basis of ethics, and above all concerning the sanction of ethics. If I mistake not,—I haven't refreshed my memory by looking at it lately,—the article which was contributed by John Boyle O'Reilly was a capital illustration of this. While he did not believe that there was any possibility of teaching ethics successfully in our public schools, he did not say that there would be any difficulty in teaching the children what is right and wrong; yet he showed clearly that in his ideas as to the sources of the ideas of right and wrong, as to the origin of ethics, and as to the sanction of ethics, he was really wide apart from many of those with whom he was carrying on the discussion.

But no matter about that. Let the Catholic, at home, teach his child any philosophy he pleases as to the origin of right and wrong; let the Evangelical Protestant teach his child, at home, anything he pleases as to the results of doing wrong, either in this world or any other world,—nobody proposes to interfere with their right to do that. But a clear and broad line of demarkation should be drawn between those ideas and the questions of fact as to what *is* right and what is wrong. These things can be taught in the public schools; and since the only interest of the State is in this question as to whether its citizens do right or wrong in this world,—since the State does not care at all, as a State, how the ideas of right and wrong originated, and since the State does not care at all, as a State, what the issue may be in another world,—why need the State fret itself about the matter?

And I wish here to touch on another point, that seems to me to settle this question forever, as to the matter of teaching religion in the public schools. What is religion, as interpreted from the point of view of the sectarian? It is simply his peculiar ideas as to God, as to the relation in which he stands to God, as to what God wants him and his children to do, and the outcome of his theology in some other world. But what is the interest of the State in this? The State cares for nothing, and properly cares for nothing, except the conduct of men and women while they live in this world, and while they are under the jurisdiction of the State. Massachusetts may be ever so proud a Commonwealth; these United States of America may be inflated with ever so much pride over the extent of our territory; but neither the Governor, nor the State Legislature, nor the President of the United States, nor the Senate, nor the House of Representatives, will ever, if sufficiently wise and modest, think of making the claim of any jurisdiction over any world that lies beyond the border-line of death. [*Laughter.*]

If is, then, to speak plainly, none of the State's business,—it is not the business of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, it is none of the business of the United States,—whether my soul after death goes up or down. That is my concern. But the State has a right to look after my conduct while I am a citizen, to see to it that I do not infringe the rights or endanger the welfare of other citizens. Here then is the limit, it seems to me, of the State's jurisdiction and the State's power. Here is a principle that makes it as clear as daylight that it is none of the State's affair, as a State, to interfere in any way whatsoever with the peculiar religious ideas or peculiar religious training of the soul of any one of its citizens.

Now let us see what some of the proposed solutions are. The Catholic says that our schools are godless. He wants his child not only intellectually trained, not only mentally trained, but he wants his soul educated into the principles of his religion, and so brought into a condition of safety as related to God. That is all well. The Catholic has a perfect right to look after that; but, as I have said, it is none of the State's business to look after that, and the parent has no business to delegate such a duty as that to the State. We will grant that the public school does not have anything specifically to do with the Catholic conception of God. But, from another point of view, let us see how utterly impossible it is that any system of true instruction can get away from God. If God be the God of this universe, the God of this world; if he be the life and power manifested in the most distant star; if he be the same life and power that, as the dust-grain flies in the street, swings it in its orbit as surely as the mightiest planet; if he be the life and power of the wind that fills the sail of the shipmaster as he crosses the sea; if he be the life and power of the steam that, working in the hold, drives the great ship in the face of wind and tide; if he be the life and power expressed in the laws of ocean currents, the laws of magnetic currents, the laws that give life and power to all this thrilling, throbbing world of ours; if he be the inherent, the constituent life of all things; then wherever we face, we are facing God; whatever we learn, we are learning God; whatever we do, we are doing through co-operation with God. I am a Theist, from the crown of my head to the soles of my feet. I never believed a thousandth part so much in God, in the old days of my orthodoxy, as I do to-day. I believe he is not on some distant planet away above the blue, but here and everywhere. I face him as I face the blue sky; I face him as I hold in my hand a tiny flower; I face him as I look into the eyes of a friend. He is before me and behind me, he encompasses me on every side, he lays his hand upon me. To me, then, occupying this point of view, no study can be godless. [*Applause.*]

But the Catholic does not occupy my point of view. He does not think of my kind of God, and therefore the studies that the child is put to in the common schools are to his mind godless studies. So be it. What shall we do about it? Shall we divide the school money to suit him? Just think of the dilemma we should be put in if we attempted any such thing. If there was nobody in this country but

Protestants and Catholics, and they were divided into such a proportion that it would be easy to assign each his share of money, then it might be practicable, provided the State should still hold in its hand such a power of superintendence as to see to it that an equal standard of education should be maintained on both sides of the dividing line. But here are people of all shades of belief. I take it that if we are going to teach religion in the public schools, such teaching as would suit the Editor of the *Congregationalist* might not suit a Professor at Andover; what would have suited Dr. Channing would not have suited Theodore Parker; what would have suited Theodore Parker in his day would not suit O. B. Frothingham, or my friend Higginson here. I am not willing to have my children taught any kind of religion in the public schools, unless I can have somebody as a teacher who is pretty nearly in agreement with me. I do not question the right of anybody else to teach his children as he pleases, but I want to have something to say about the teaching of my children myself; and I take it that every earnest and free man feels the same. So it seems to me utterly impracticable to talk about any division of the school money. There would be no possibility of so arranging it that justice would be done, and a proper degree of education maintained.

A proposition has been made, by no less a person than President Eliot of Harvard, that I cannot help looking on as a very strange one to emanate from such a source. If I do not misrepresent it, it is that representatives of the different religions shall have a certain amount of time assigned to them, in which they shall go into the public schools and teach their religious ideas to the children of such parents as desire it. It seems to me he would find it a very cumbrous and impracticable scheme, if he attempted to carry it out. The greatest question that we are facing to-day is to find time enough, without breaking down the children or making them subjects for an insane-asylum, to teach them half the things we are trying to teach already. That idea alone, it seems to me, is enough to put a quietus to the plan suggested.

What next? Parochial schools? Yes, if you please. I see no reason why the Catholics, and Protestants too, for that matter, should not organize and maintain just as many private or parochial schools as they please; only, for one,—and I would like to face that fact and carry it just as far as possible over this land,—I do not believe that it is a good thing for any boy or girl to attend any private school, in comparison with the benefits which are to be derived from a public school. In the first place, I don't believe that private schools, however select, are a bit more moral than public schools; and in the next place, I think it a distinct and definite misfortune for a child to be secluded, and kept under glass, until he is suddenly precipitated into the midst of a great world, of which he has had no opportunity to become acquainted beforehand. I like my boy to go to a school in which all religions, all nationalities, all grades of culture and no culture, all grades of character and no character, all grades of cleanliness and no cleanliness, all grades of good clothes and bad clothes, are represented. I like to have him in the midst of a little world, my little man learning what it means to measure heads with other little men; learning that the boy with a patch on his knee, and another on his elbow, can outwit him at his studies; learning that the boy who is poor may leave him hopelessly behind; learning that the boy he has heard sneered at as a Paddy, or a Jew, can beat him every time in his lessons. It is a wholesome thing for a boy to learn.

I say, then, that I believe it is a misfortune for children to be educated in private schools. But I would not empower the State to interfere with them, provided the parents of these children will support a public school which will be equal in character and grade with the teachings of the private schools.

But it seems to me that it is utterly hopeless for us to look for any theory by which religious instruction can be given in the public schools. Shall we keep the bible in the public schools? I don't believe that any free, earnest man, who remembers his own childhood and the methods of his own teaching as a boy, will be in favor of keeping the bible in the public schools, in the fragmentary, haphazard way in which it is used to-day. In the first place, it is a farce, if nothing else,—simply reading a certain amount of the New Testament or the Old, selected by the teacher haphazard, without note or comment. I know that the only thing I got out of that kind of reading of the bible, when I was a boy, was to get such associations with certain texts that, the same not being explained to me, seemed so utterly absurd and ridiculous that it is almost impossible for me to read them in the pulpit with a sober face. The sooner such things are over, the better. I remember the most ridiculous, absurd figures of boys, standing and stumbling through certain passages of scripture; they have stuck in my mind ever since. In the first place, this is not worthy to be called religious education. If we are to have religious education in schools at all, supply them with something that shall be worthy of the name of religious education, whether it be one thing or another.

To conclude,—as I have taken quite as much time as I intended, already,—it seems to me that the one thing we need to do is to forever separate religion and the education in our public schools from each other. They ought not to have anything whatever to do with each other. It is one of the aims, and ought to be one of the aims, of this Free Religious Association, until the end is attained, to completely secularize the State in every particular. [*Applause.*]

I read a little newspaper item the other day which gave me a bit of hope. I confess I have been a little troubled about some of the views of our national administration. It has seemed to me that there was too much of a tendency on the part of the President not only to be good himself, but to want to make everybody else good after his own fashion, with the help of the Postmaster General. [*Laughter.*] But I feel that I ought to say a kind word for the Secretary of State, after this item I saw in the paper. A converted Jew, if I remember correctly, was being urged to go as Consul to Jerusalem; and it was being pressed upon the State Department that he was peculiarly fitted to go there, as, being an earnest Christian, he would render great aid in the converting of his fellow-Jews to Christianity. Mr. Blaine looked over the recommendations, and quietly wrote on the back of them that, as the State Department was not an Evangelical institution, the reasons given were not relevant. [*Laughter.*] We want to reach the time when not only the State Department will surrender its claim to being an Evangelical or religious institution, but when the government as a whole, all the way down, shall lay aside its claim to exercise any influence on the religious life or education of the people whatsoever. The only thing I am afraid of concerning our public schools is religious bigotry; and bigotry is of so human a quality that it is not all included in any one denomination with which I am acquainted. I don't believe in Catholic bigotry; I don't believe in Protestant bigotry; I don't believe in Evangelical bigotry, or in Unitarian bigotry; I don't believe in Jewish or atheistic bigotry. Let us rear and keep our public-school system as the one grand means, in public hands and under public control, that shall train and fit our children, our boys and our girls, for self-respecting, self-supporting, intelligent, chaste and righteous citizenship. That is the one thing, the first, the middle, the last, for which the public school exists. It has no right to exist on any other basis. Let us, then,

against all comers,—telling them to teach whatever they please at their homes, Sunday-schools, churches or private schools,—maintain the integrity of our public-school system. [*Applause.*]

ADDRESS OF REV. J. W. HAMILTON (Methodist).

Mr. President, Sister and Brother Americans:

I HAVE always believed that the first claim to intelligence was the ability to know something; and the next, which is scarcely second to it, is the ability to give some reason for what we know. I think I know that I am an American; and in the light of that something which is the broad and fundamental idea of American institutions, I am a Republican and a Democrat. I believe in the government which derives its just powers from the consent of the governed. But I accept the history as well as the philosophy of American institutions.

Ours is a Christian nation. (I use the word Christian in no narrow and merely shallow denominational sense. I am not particular to find Christian names and Christian doctrines written out in the letters of the laws of the land. But I do find everywhere in the laws and life of the nation the essential principles and the inspiration of Christianity.) We are not a nation of atheists nor pantheists nor polytheists. We are not Buddhists nor Brahmins, Confucianists, nor Zoroastrians, nor even Jews nor Mohammedans: we are Christians. In our political constitution, we are not Roman Catholic—in the sense which subordinates the State to the Church—but Protestant; both the spirit and letter of our institutions, as well as their history, are against the dominant claims of a hierarchical institution.

Every cordial invitation we extend to the people in other nations of the earth, to come to these shores and find a home, is conditioned by the presupposition that they come here to be American citizens, and Christian men and Christian women. We are not inviting anarchists, monarchists, oligarchists, or the representatives of any feudal or other foreign despotism, to come to this country, unless they come to be Americans and consistent Americans. We are not fostering paganism in America, but Christianity. Consistency requires that we do not hold out special inducement to alien peoples to build here Joss-houses, Buddhistic temples, or pagan pantheons of any kind. (What these foreign systems of religion contain which is good we already have; what they include that is bad we do not want. We do not encourage the immigration of foreign organized forms of faith, even if we may admit and welcome the adherents of those faiths to all the rights and enjoyments of Christian citizenship.) We do encourage the building of Christian churches. This is the history of our civilization. To adhere consistently to its claims, will make Buddhism, Mohammedanism, and all other forms of alien faith, impossible here. They each require conditions of life for propagation which are impossible here. The caste distinctions and asceticism of these religions, for instance, are impolitic, impossible here. This is a Christian country, not only in its Old and New Testaments, but in all its forms of life and work. There may be much inconsistency and hypocrisy here, but this is a Christian country in all its schools, trades, government and churches. Paganisn can not endure our methods. We wear Christian clothes, eat Christian food, sleep in Christian beds, and strive to be Christian men and Christian women; and the generations who conform to these methods and do these things will soon or late be a Christian people.

The people of other lands who turn their eyes to America, do so not to find in this inviting country the conditions, habits, or requirements of their own countries, but such, and such only as we have here. They do not come here to make us Chinese, Hindus, or Germans, but they come here to get what Americans have got, and they expect themselves to be Americans when they get here. They do not come here to make this another China, Hindostan, or Germany. The people of other countries are hurrying to these shores because it is the best place on the earth for the one man: not a race, but a man. Here the one man builds him a house and gathers him a home, and, in the full exercise of all his immunities and privileges as an American citizen, is the sovereign man. The world believes to-day that the best man this best country affords is the most Christian man.

As Americans, we do not accept the theories that the nation is "a necessary evil," "an historical accident," "a Jural Society," or a mere "Economic Society." We do not find the origin of the nation simply and solely "in the development of the family,"—"in mere force or might," "in some instinct or emotion of man," "in the social contract," or, indeed, "in popular sovereignty." We believe the nation to be divinely ordered, and its foundations laid in its moral being and personality, in its government, in its authority and powers, "in the facts which indicate the consciousness of the people," and "in the facts which indicate the conscience of the people." In fostering and improving our national interests, we believe, with Wendell Phillips, that "education is the only interest worthy the deep, controlling anxiety of the thoughtful man." And we would have our youth use the language of Milton, "Inflamed with the study of learning and the admiration of virtue; stirred up with high hopes of living to be brave men and worthy patriots, dear to God and famous to all ages."

In promoting education, we believe the Christian State, which next to the Christian Church is the ideal of all human organizations, is not only entitled to educate, but that it is solemnly charged with the duty of educating all our youth to be good citizens. Lord Macaulay once said in Parliament, "Illustrious forever in history were the founders of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts; though their love of freedom of conscience was illimitable and indestructible, they could see nothing servile or degrading in the principle that the State should take upon itself the charge of the education of the people. In the year 1642 they passed their first enactment on this subject, in the preamble of which they distinctly pledged themselves to this principle, that education was a matter of the deepest possible importance, and the greatest possible interest to all nations and to all communities, and that as such it was, in an eminent degree, deserving of the peculiar attention of the State."

In conceding to the State the right to educate the children of its citizens, no interference with the right of the parents, or the right of the Church, is admitted. "The State has a right to guard its own existence, and to provide for what is essential to its well-being." The Rev. George P. Fisher, D. D., says, "There can be no parental claim that nullifies this right; for the child has duties to perform as a member of the civil community, as well as obligations within the family circle."

The State must not be sectarian in its education. The First Amendment to the Constitution of the United States provides that the "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion or prohibiting the free exercise thereof." And the Constitution of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts provides that "every denomination of Christians, demeaning themselves peaceably, and as good subjects of the Commonwealth, shall be equally under the protection of the law; and no subordination of any sect or denomination to another shall ever be established by law."

But a purely secular education has never been dreamed for America. No Christian State could recognize a purely secular education as competent to furnish its children with the qualifications necessary to make them good Christian

citizens. Chief Justice Cooley says, "The Christian religion was always recognized in the administration of the common law; and so far as that law continues to be the law of the land, the fundamental principles of that religion must continue to be recognized in the same sense and to the same extent." Recognizing this principle in the education of children, Massachusetts has enacted the Statute now in force, — Sect. 15, — that "It shall be the duty of the president, professors, and tutors of the University at Cambridge, and of the several colleges, of all preceptors, and teachers of academies, and of all the instructors of youth, to exert their best endeavors to impress on the minds of children and youth committed to their care and instruction the principles of piety and justice, and a sacred regard to truth: love of their country, humanity, and universal benevolence; sobriety, industry and frugality; chastity, moderation and temperance; and those other virtues which are the ornament of human society, and the basis upon which a republican constitution is founded; and it shall be the duty of such instructors to endeavor to lead their pupils, as their ages and capacities will admit, into a clear understanding of the tendency of the above-mentioned virtues, to preserve and perfect a republican constitution, and secure the blessings of liberty, as well as to promote their future happiness, and also to point out to them the evil tendency of the opposite vices."

Sect. 16. "The resident ministers of the gospel, the selectmen, and the school-committees, shall exert their influence and use their best endeavors that the youth of their towns shall regularly attend the schools established for their instruction."

Accepting the bible as the Magna Charta of civil and religious liberty, the State further provides, Sect. 32, that "The school-committee shall require the daily reading in the public schools of some portion of the bible, without written note or oral comment; but they shall not require a scholar, whose parent or guardian informs the teacher in writing that he has conscientious scruples against it, to read from any particular version, or to take any personal part in the reading; nor shall they direct to be purchased or used in the public schools, school-books calculated to favor the tenets of any particular sect of Christians."

Our honored Chairman, Colonel Higginson, tells me he is the author of that Statute. And I must believe that he framed the law, in that form, in deference to the controlling influence of the Christian revelation in our public school system, and among our people.

In the able and admirable address of Mr. Savage, most of which, with you, I could most heartily accept, he mentions an argument in favor of taking the bible from the schools which must appear to you, as it does to me, more an argument in favor of taking the teacher, than the book, out of the schools. The teacher who is indifferent to the teaching or who trifles with the text of any book put in his or her hand for the purpose of instruction, could so treat the matter as to excite, in the minds of young people not old enough to understand many things written in the book, a disposition to be indifferent and trifling also. I find the very same objection to taking the bible out of the public schools that I find to taking the Christian teacher out of the schools. He is the Christian man that he is, in all his knowing and knowledge, and in all his teaching and instruction. Take his Christianity away from him and you take away from him all that distinguishes him; — you take away his personality and power. It will be impossible to analyze the Christian character, and to take away everything which is Christian about it, of instruction, spirit and influence, and leave anything which it will be desirable to keep in a Christian school in a Christian country. The best part of Christianity is the spirit and life of it; the best part of the bible is the spirit of it. Its very presence in the school is an instruction. It is the index-finger which shows the way the school is going. This spirit of Christian instruction always goes with it. It is everywhere, and in everything. It is in the Christian country as the atmosphere is in it. You breathe it and cannot live without it. It is in the fire, but you cannot burn it; it is in the water, but you cannot drown it; it is in the earth, but you cannot bury it; it is in the air, but you cannot get rid of it.

There is something, too, in the fact that the bible is now in the school and has always been there. The common school system is itself the child of the Christian church; it was born in it, and was reared in it. There is more objection to taking the bible out of the school, than there possibly could be to keeping it out, if it had never been in. It has made them what they are. And it is not Christian people who are at work in the interest of Christian people, and for the sake of getting the most out of Christian instruction and Christian life, who are so enamored of the Index Expurgatorious. As in Japan, when Christianity was introduced, a new system of music was introduced, so in the introduction of Christianity among any people, the thoughts and habits of thinking — the life and manners of the people — are changed. The best of everything comes in. The best musicians of the world are in Christian countries; there is no high order of eloquence out of the Christian country. There is nothing to sing, there is nothing to speak.

That was a significant thing which occurred in New York during the Centennial Anniversary of George Washington's inauguration. The very bible which Washington had taken in his hands was brought forward in the exercises, and introduced as an interesting and appropriate memento of the exercises connected with the inauguration one hundred years before. Washington was dead and buried, but there was the book which had most distinguished his education and work, and the form of government which was introduced in his inauguration. That book typified the character and life of the President and people of the United States then; it typifies the character and life of the President and people of the United States now. The correspondence of the enactments of Massachusetts to the fundamental law of the United States is in harmony with the history of all our institutions, and the public opinion of our great leaders and great masses of our people.

George Washington said, "The free cultivation of letters, the unbounded extension of commerce, the progressive refinement of manners, the growing liberality of sentiment, and — above all — the pure and bright light of Revelation, have had ameliorating influence on mankind, and increased the blessings of society. Of all the dispositions and habits which lead to political prosperity, Religion and Morality are indispensable."

Thomas Jefferson said, "I have always said, and always will say, that the studious perusal of the sacred volume will make better citizens, better fathers and better husbands."

John Adams said, "I have examined all as well as my narrow sphere, my straitened means, and my busy life would allow me; and the result is, that the bible is the best book in the world. It contains more of my little philosophy than all the libraries I have seen. And such parts of it as I cannot reconcile to my little philosophy I postpone for future investigation."

Similar tributes to the bible, religion, and morality could be quoted from John Quincy Adams, Abraham Lincoln, General Grant, Daniel Webster, Charles Sumner, and many others.

There may be those among us who are no believers in a Christian system, that will oppose the education of youth in Christian knowledge and conduct; but they will do so against all the spirit and history of our institutions. There may be others, like certain of the Roman Catholic church, who favor sectarian instruction in the schools. But they are opposed, by the traditions of their church, to the spirit of all American civil and religious liberty, and their parochial schools are a protest against the public schools.

I am an American with American instincts, and I believe in American institutions for Americans, as they were in the beginning, are now, and ever will be, let us pray, world without end, Amen, and Amen.

THE CHAIRMAN: — In order to show that there was, in the minds of the organizers of this meeting, a desire to have every view expressed, I will take this opportunity of stating that it was strongly hoped at one time that the Rev. Dr. Bodfish, of the Roman Catholic church, would be here to speak on this question. We have here, however, several other speakers, one of whom has a name as well known to the Catholic church as the name of Dr. Bodfish. But before introducing him, we will listen to one whose countenance was familiar to us in years past, yet who cannot be seen or heard too often among us, — Mrs. Ednah D. Cheney.

ADDRESS OF MRS. E. D. CHENEY.

Ladies and Gentlemen:

IT is a very hard position, as a friend remarked yesterday in another meeting, to come into a gathering to speak with so many others; and especially in my case at the present time, sandwiched between the first speaker, whose thorough knowledge and logic are so well known, and the eloquent Chairman, who fills up every gap. I always think, on such occasions, of the little boy in a Connecticut school, when the teacher told the children to each of them think of a river, and be ready to answer when she asked for the title. They each thought of a river, and the first one named boldly answered, "The Connecticut." She called rather quickly upon the next one, and he could only answer, "Jim has got my river." I feel very much that Mr. Savage has got my river this morning, he has stated the case so strongly and so completely. But if I can pick up a few little rivers, I am sure that in the hands of our Chairman, if they are small to me, they will swell into great rivers when we come to his eloquent speech.

Mr. Higginson says that we originally found five definitions of religion. It is therefore very difficult to talk understandingly without definition of terms. But I don't want to go into that to-day, but to talk of religion as a word that we have loved all our lives,—the best and highest thing that we have in life. In regard to the schools, I think too much has been said about instruction in religion, and too little about education in religion. The two things are quite different. Instruction in religion, as in all other things, is the laying down of dogmas to be accepted by the people; education in religion, as in everything else, is drawing out the inner thought and life of the pupil; and that is what our public schools do for the religious nature of the children. I should not hesitate to affirm that there is no agency whatever that is doing more for the education of the children in this sense than our public schools. They don't instruct in dogmas; but they do, by their constant training of the mind, by the very fact of their existence, bring out the real social relations of one human being to another. That is the best work of religion. The schools are a part of life, and they educate the religious nature in the children. As Mr. Savage has hinted, when a child finds himself in a school, he is no longer the pet child of the family, but is thrown into a world where he is to respect all others as having equal rights and equal claims with himself. And that is the very first step in religion — to recognize that it is not an individual state, but a universal home, which is to be respected and revered; and every child soon finds that he must respect the rights of others.

It has been well said that every study leads to religious education. The child who earnestly devotes himself to study soon finds that truth, fidelity, industry, and every one of the virtues, are necessary for him to accomplish his purposes. He soon finds that, for his well-being in the school, kindness towards his neighbors, kindness towards friends, and, still more, justice to all, are necessary for his own standing. What is more severe than the sense of justice that is developed in a large school? What boy in a large school doesn't come to learn that, of right, there is demanded of him the highest exercise of justice towards his fellows? It is in this way that I think the moral and religious education of children is carried on in the public schools, far more than by any direct precepts or by the study of text-books. The philosophy of morals and religion may be studied from text-books. I don't object to that; but there is no teacher like work, no teacher like responsibility; and every child in the public schools stands on his own responsibility, no matter whether he comes from Beacon street or Ann street. When he goes into the public school, he is shown that he may be what he is able to be; and what greater teacher of the principles of religion is there than that?

I was very much struck the other day by a remark which one of the Unitarian clergymen, well known to you all, Mr. Hale, made, in reference to the work of the teachers in the public schools. Through this work, through and for the children, is developed among the teachers a sense of humanity, a sense of responsibility to these little creatures to whom they are probably, in many cases, the best influence they have ever known, that gives them the wonderful power of meeting them, and therefore of meeting the families to which they belong, — which, as Mr. Hale said, every clergyman must envy. And, through the teachers, — not by direct instruction, but by that far greater education of one high and noble life coming into relation with those less developed and less educated, — there is a kind of "religious induction," I may call it, a drawing out of the life and latent strength of the child, which many a man in after experience looks back to as the beginning of a noble course of life. And that is the instrumentality that we must seek for to produce the religious education of our schools, — the teachers. It is the high character of the teachers which is to develop the character of the scholars. And until we make that the very first point, — that we should secure for our schools men and women of the highest character, — it will be impossible to reach the highest attainment in literature, or in the higher morality, which is worth so much more.

In order to do that, we must secure for the teachers a higher regard in public opinion; and in order to accomplish that, we ought to give them a higher salary, that we may secure the best. It is one of the peculiar features of the public schools, — the great number of women engaged in them. We ought to have the very best women in the land engaged in our schools. And yet what do we do? We hold out to them no hope of reaching the highest places in the schools. A woman may toil years and years in school, doing her utmost, and then, at the end of a long course of years, see a young man fresh from the Normal School put over her head, with double salary. And there is no reason for this, except that "women shall not be masters of the school." It is said that woman's nature is a religious nature. If it is so, having put them into our schools, we ought to give them every encouragement, that we may have the best there, and not turn them into private schools where their labors are better rewarded.

I believe that the State has an entire right to educate its children, for the safety and well-being of the State; but I don't believe it has a right to impose upon anybody any religious doctrine. I consider that this is a Christian State in no other sense than that the majority of its people are called Christians. I don't believe that Christianity, except as we often use the word as another name for virtue, has any more right than any other religion to have its fair trial. For one, I hope the Chinaman will bring his Confucius with him. [*Applause.*] And I hope that that volume will be placed in the libraries of our public schools, and be read by the teachers whenever they find in it the best representation of any virtue they wish to inculcate. I would like to have the Five Commandments of Buddha written up in our schools, especially that noble one with which there is no other injunction or truth to be compared, "Thou shalt not, by act or word, cause another to believe that which is not true." [*Applause.*] I would like to see the Jewish Synagogue here; and I rejoice most heartily that we have upon our School Committee, now, a Jew, whom we delight to honor. [*Applause.*] When the disciples of Mohammed come among us in any number, I am sure that, out of that beautiful Koran, they will bring pearls of thought with them that will do us all good. If we have any mission as a nation, I believe it is that we are to unite all these races and religions in one grand symphony, that will carry the world onward to a life which it has never yet known. [*Applause.*]

The Chairman:—We have among us a gentleman whose name has been well known throughout the nation, and whom we urged first to address us this afternoon in reference to the labor-questions, of which he is a prominent advocate. But as he was unable to be here this afternoon, and is also familiar with the subject of this morning, we have asked him to speak to us now; and I am sure I shall have your co-operation when I invite to the platform the Rev. Dr. McGlynn. [*Great applause.*]

ADDRESS OF REV. EDWARD McGLYNN.

Mr. Chairman, Ladies and Gentlemen:

It was only last evening that I was informed that my presence here this morning was desired, and, strange to say, it was only as I came into the hall this morning that I learned the subject for this morning's discussion. It was with no affectation of modesty, it was in all earnestness, that I said I should very much prefer to remain a listener, to take no active part in the discussion; yet it is one of my strongest weaknesses to obey, as probably some of you know [*laughter*], and therefore in spite of much reluctant diffidence I stand here in obedience to the request of your excellent Chairman and of your Committee.

I have listened with great admiration to the address of the first speaker. [*Applause.*] I concur with him, I suppose I can say entirely, or almost entirely; and I feel very much as the excellent lady, who has just charmed us, said on arising, that he has so covered the field that he leaves very little for me to consider. I feel that I should simply say, as a certain silent member of Parliament is reported to have said once, in, I believe, his first and last speech: "I say ditto to Mr. Burke." [*Laughter.*] Yet it is only natural, perhaps, that you should expect from me some little additional contribution to the discussion of this subject, because of the very peculiar and exceptional position that I happen to hold to-day. Some of you, no doubt most of you, are aware that I am a Catholic priest; that I have devoted the best energies of my life to the preaching of the doctrines, and the administering of the sacraments, in a word, to the work, of the Catholic ministry; and it may perhaps surprise some of you a little to learn that I am as much of a Catholic to-day, and as truly a Catholic priest in belief, in sympathy, in affection, as ever I was. [*Applause.*] Some of my critics might say, "That isn't saying much for your former condition"; and I make haste to say, in legitimate self-defence, that I am, and ever have been, by affection, by the earliest aspirations of my childhood, by education, by voluntary and sincere conviction, a believer in and teacher of the doctrines of the Catholic church; and I am perfectly frank to say that it was because of my intense belief in the teaching of the Catholic church, my desire, like Paul, to see all men converted, that I was led to study into the natural and necessary cause of the much that is human in them. Because of my desire to convert all men to the Catholic religion as I understood it, and to the enjoyment of its blessings, I deplored exceedingly what I considered a blunder, and therefore, under the circumstances, a crime, on the part of so many of my co-religionists, — not so much, to be sure, of the laity as of the clergy; and not so much of what is called the second order of the clergy, the priesthood, as of the bishops, the prelates. The blunder consisted in their beginning, some thirty or forty years ago, to announce and enforce, as best they could, a policy by which they would isolate the Catholic children from, or at all events take them from the advantages and the influences of, the public schools, and give them some sort of an education in the little private church-schools. I am intensely conscious that I certainly desired the best interests of the Catholic church; that I desired to propagate its teachings, because, as I understood them, they were the teachings of Christ; because that religion, as I took it, was the primitive Christian religion coming down from Christ to his Apostles; and I felt that this, to me, insane policy, was one of the greatest possible stumbling-blocks in the way of the propagation of the Catholic religion; that the separating of Catholic children in Catholic schools, far from maintaining them Catholics and helping them to convert others to Catholicism, would be, rather, one of the most powerful influences to drive vast multitudes of Catholics out of the church. It was the desire to prevent such a great evil that made me indiscreet enough, some twenty years ago, to protest against the system of having separate parochial schools.

It may be interesting for you to know some of the special objections. In the first place, here is a population composed chiefly of new comers from various parts of the world. It consists, as a matter of course, of the poor, of the wage-workers, and largely of that class who occupy what may be called the lowest social strata. Very naturally, the old comers were in possession of the good things, and the new comers had to take what was left. Also as a matter of course, then, the new comers, who came to this country to better their condition, had to remain for a time comparatively poor. But in a single generation they have assumed the work of building churches, very frequently far too costly, and cathedrals rivalling, in the first generation of catholicity in this country, the costly works of the church in the Old Country, which the Catholics there never thought of beginning till they were strong in the strength of eight or nine hundred years of existence. And, with all this, they began in this country to force upon the people an edifice, almost as costly as the church, in the name of a school. One of our bishops uttered a sentiment that has been extremely disastrous to the best interests of the Catholic church in this country. He said, "The time is coming, in fact we may say that the time has already come, when we must build the school first and the church afterwards." And others have taken up the cry.

Now here was a strange perversion of the original mission of the Catholic church. To justify this perversion, some of these good men said, "We have been sent by Christ to teach, haven't we? Doesn't he say, 'Go into the whole world and teach all nations'?" Then they actually had to

mutilate the text by putting in a full stop, where in the original there is apparently no stop at all. I say, "Yes; go and teach all nations"; — but finish the sentence. Teach what? Did Christ tell you to teach botany, or geology, or writing, or arithmetic? "Teach all things whatsoever I have commanded you." And Christ has given us not only his command to teach, but his promise to support us in teaching, — what? Secular science? No; in teaching the things that he commanded. Now, if you can prove to me that Christ made these things a part of his mission, then I am willing to acknowledge your mission to teach these things. But even then, what strange folly it is that, being sent out by Christ to establish a school, you are not satisfied to build one, but have to build two. I grant that he sent you to teach certain doctrines, and you have started out with great expense to build a house in which to teach that. You call that a church. Now I say, if Christ has commanded you to build a parochial school, that which you call a church is a parochial school. But, as an apparent confession of loss of faith in the efficacy of your own divine mission and consecration to the ministry of Christ, scarcely have you finished the building of Christ's school, — the church, — when almost next door you begin another school, for the teaching of something else to supplement the teaching of the church. It is really a confession of failure. It is a sort of cry of despair on the part of the clergymen of the Catholic church, that somehow or other they are inadequate to do the work for which they were sent; and so they would practically sit down, and invite lay teachers to come and do the work. And it has gone so far that, as a matter of fact, priests have confessed to me that practically the whole bulk of their people were going to the dogs; that they had to sit still and let them go to the dogs; and that their only hope for the future was in building a school and saving the children. Strange as that confession seems, I declare that it has been made to me by a pastor in New York, who indicated that he had forty thousand nominal Catholics within a small territory, ministered to by only one small church, with only two assistant pastors. The great bulk of the people were going to the dogs, and nothing could be done to prevent it. "And now," said he, "we must look out for the children." In such a condition of things it is very obvious that very little can be done even for the children. His school was utterly inadequate to supply the wants of the children of such a vast parish. He had but a few hundred out of several thousand of the children. As a matter of fact, they were filling the public schools, whether he would have it so or not.

But in spite of their voice against the public schools, the schools are full of Catholic teachers. Those good men would invite certain foreign missionaries to preach to their people at a so-called mission, and yet actually command the people to take their children away from the public schools, under the penalty of being refused the sacraments, and all that, — schools actually full of Catholic teachers! And the poor parents are guilty of a sort of trick in circumventing the mission, — taking away their children for a short time, knowing that they will have to send them back again in order to obtain a fair education.

Now here is the practical condition of things that is staring the Catholic church in the face everywhere. There is the whole world to be converted, according to their own theory, and yet they sit down and confess the failure of the ministry, and say the only way of doing their work is to get up little schools, to teach all sorts of things that Christ never taught at all, and for the mere sake of sandwiching a little religious teaching between the writing and arithmetic. That is one of the avowed reasons for it.

It was because I thought I saw clearly the utter folly, the wastefulness and strain upon the resources of the people, and the burden that was being laid upon the clergy, that I raised my voice a little, and acquired what was considered the very unenviable reputation of being liberal on the school question. I am glad to be able to say that I have no very great regard for the liberalism or liberality that consists in giving away something that doesn't belong to us. Therefore I make haste to say that if I am supposed to be somewhat liberal on this question, it is not that I am willing to give away anything that I believe to be essential, or that the Catholic church believes to be essential, to the teaching of religion.

The whole of this question of parochial schools is a question of policy, in which there may be considerable room for difference of opinion; but, on account of the growing tendency to absolutism in the government of the Catholic church, the growing tendency to allow both people and clergy to have less and less to say about the building or administration of their churches, there is very little room for an expression of diversity of opinion. You may have, here in this city of Boston, a bishop disposed to be liberal and of common sense, but some fanatical priest of his may anticipate his policy; and the very bishop who might be supposed to be a leader seems to feel coerced into silence, seems not to dare to rebuke that priest, and sooner or later the fanatics carry the day, — many of them foreigners, — natives of Scotland, Ireland or Germany; most of them not denying the hope that a large portion of our country some day may be practically foreign, may be practically a little Germany, for instance. Under the dictation of a few men, the Catholic clergymen and people have actually been cudgelled into a supposed unanimity in favor of parochial schools. The demand for this never came from the people, and to a great extent it never came from the clergymen. A very large portion of the clergy are simply coerced, — under an implied threat of expulsion from the churches they have done so much to build up, — into plunging their parishes into debt for the building of parochial schools. It is largely a mere sham. The people will comply with the law in regard to getting up the parochial schools, but there will be found an indifference on the part of the priest as to the character of that school. He has obeyed the letter of the law; he has done his duty, and all that can reasonably be expected; and the children of the parish can go to that school, to the public school, or to any school they see fit. Some of our clergymen, however, have been heard to avow that it was better for the children to grow up like savages on the street than to go to these forbidden public schools.

As has been suggested in the remarks of Mr. Savage, the reason of this antagonism to the public schools is, substantially, that it is held to be necessary to teach religion to the children. Now anybody that agrees truly with religion, and has a clear conviction of religion, it strikes me should agree in the propriety of this. Of course some people believe in allowing boys and girls to reach a certain maturity of age before inviting them to join the church; but it strikes me that any parent who has a clear conviction of and a belief in religion, should surely teach his child the knowledge that is most precious to him, and not allow the child to grow up in ignorance of it. At all events, I have no question that it is the duty of the Christian church, and of people who believe in the Christian church, to teach their children religion.

But then, the ideal public school would not teach any sectarian religion at all; it would not even teach positive Christianity; and therefore the opponents of the public schools say they are godless schools. I say that here is a fallacy. Here is a gross outrage done to the public schools. They are not necessarily godless because they don't teach positively the existence of God. The time spent in the school-room is but a small portion of a child's life. It is

only four or five hours a day out of the twenty-four; it is only five days out of seven in the week, and it is only ten months out of twelve in the year; and the mere fact that during a certain number of hours in a certain place there is no positive teaching of religion, of the existence of God and of his attributes, and of revealed religion, doesn't necessarily make that time or place godless. Let us suppose that, even in one of these parochial schools, that are supposed to be consecrated to the teaching of religion, there was a class-room devoted to the teaching of arithmetic; that in the class-room there was a professor teaching nothing but arithmetic to classes in various degrees of advancement; that over the door of that room there should be written the word, "Mathematics"; we can easily perceive how, from the beginning to the end of the school day, the whole year long, or for a century, the word "religion" need not be mentioned in that room. Now should the more pious parents say, "That class-room is a godless one; it is a blight upon the souls of our dear children to have them go into that room. The word 'God' is never mentioned. They are talking about arithmetic all the time, and there is nothing to indicate anything about God. Beware of that godless arithmetic-room"?

Are there not many things in life, in which the most intensely religious men and women are engaged, at times and places where there is not one word of religion? Would it be just or proper to denounce them as godless because they are dedicated to buying and selling dry-goods or shoes, or to the manufacture of these things? Must we actually say that your young men and women, and your boys and girls, are in imminent danger of losing their souls, because they are working in a godless factory, in which from time to time there isn't some little reminder of the existence of God, where they do not cease from work from time to time to say a short prayer, or where work isn't begun and ended with prayer? You see this is reducing the thing, as the philosophers say, to the absurd. The use of the word is an improper one. They imply that practically a knowledge of God is kept from the children, so that the children are permitted to grow up without knowing that there is a God, without knowing anything about him, because of the brief time in the school-room that they are condemned to exist without hearing anything about him. Those who call the schools godless, by an illogical practice that is common to poor human nature, work themselves up to a frame of mind in which they practically believe that the public schools deny God. This is a brutal calumny upon the public schools. If there were teachers who were doubtful as to the existence of God or even denied his existence, it wouldn't necessarily follow that in the teachings in school there would be any denying God. I am not sure but the people of this Commonwealth, and of every Commonwealth in this broad land, would rise up in indignation and compel a cessation of such teaching, and would, if necessary, expel the teachers who were detected in such an outrage upon the faith and religion of the people. I am sure that nothing is better understood than the duty of the teachers and school-officers, no matter what may be their private opinion about God, not to thrust their Godliness or their unbelief upon their pupils. As a matter of fact, and in spite of the fact that the ideal public school will have no religion taught in it, the public schools have opportunity even here to come nearer to our ideals of God, not only in the sense in which Mr. Savage spoke — that all human aspiration finally leads to that supreme ideal we believe to be God — but because, as a matter of fact, our whole literature is stained with this idea of God. And the parent who would have the best reason to complain of our public schools to-day is the man who positively disbelieves in God; because his children, if left entirely to the influences of the public school, would speedily become believers in God. For surely you cannot have any extensive reading of any literature whatsoever without becoming full of the idea of God; and even the most pronounced secularist, the most advanced atheist, the deniers of the existence of God, I have not heard are guilty of the folly of wishing to mutilate our literature, taking their pen-knives and cutting out the words "God" and "divine," even at the expense of mutilating and spoiling some of the most magnificent passages of our literature. The word "God," or kindred words, are sometimes found necessary for the rhyme, and they certainly will not mutilate hymns by expunging those words. No man can believe in God more than I do; no man, more than I, can believe that God is all in all; but I know, from the reading of history, what horrors and outrages have been committed on the people in the name of God. And we have to be extremely careful lest we permit the mere utterance of the name of God, and the quoting of his authority and the alleged mandates from him, to interfere with the inalienable rights of the people.

There are certain institutions supported by the State, others supported by private charity, and others that are not particularly of a charitable nature. There are so-called protectories where children may be sent, and where they remain night and day, for months and even years. Here is a totally different condition of things. I hold that it is the right of a parent whose children, through poverty or some other reason, may be committed to such an institution, — and, next to them, the right belonging to those next of kin, — to see to it that that child has some reasonable opportunity for receiving religious instruction; and a prisoner or criminal in the State Prison has not, because he has forfeited his right to physical liberty by his crime, forfeited his liberty of conscience. I hold that he has a certain right, as against the State, to receive religious instruction and ministration; and the right-minded people of every State cheerfully accord the exercise of this right to the clergymen of the various denominations, permitting them to visit the asylums and reformatory institutions, and give religious instruction to those of their own faith who desire to receive such instruction. It would be cruel, from a general Christian standpoint, to deprive the inmates of any of these institutions, at reasonable times, of the right of receiving such religious instruction as they desire.

But what has that to do with the public-school question? To the question whether the school is the best place in which religion can be taught, I say, No. And it would be immensely for the best interests of the church if she would mind her own business a little better, spending her energies in making her clergymen single-minded and earnest teachers, and sympathizing dispensers of her blessings. She would n't need, then, to utter this cry of despair, and say to the lay teachers, "Come over and do our work, for we are failing. Come over and save these people of mine, who, as far as I can help it, are going to the dogs."

Now, an orphan-asylum or prison, in which nothing should be said about God the whole year long, would more justly deserve the name of godless. There would be an injustice inflicted upon those who have a right to receive religious instruction, and an injustice inflicted upon those outside who would administer religion to them. That is a matter for the church; but she says she is not able to do it, with the abundant leisure and opportunities that she has.

The public schools, I therefore say, are not godless; and if the allegation is that they deny God, that is a still worse calumny. The immorality of the public schools is another calumny. Who are the teachers? Your wives and sisters, and your mothers; — and your children are the pupils. And are these children and these teachers so immoral that the children of another race and another church actually

cannot come near you without the danger of contamination? It is a monstrous calumny, a vile insult. It ought to be a little the other way. So many of our Catholic children are condemned to live in so unseemly conditions that indeed it is very hard for them to maintain self-respect; often they are crowded together in wretched tenement-houses, with insufficient air, and poor means of ventilation. All these things must necessarily tell upon the physical health, and upon the morality. And, if anything, those who are not in the Catholic church might rather fear contamination of the morals of their children by contact with those of a rather lower social order. But I agree with the sentiment of Mr. Savage that it is good for a boy to send him into a public school, where he shall see the world in miniature, where he shall see the ill-dressed and the well-dressed, the cleanly and the not quite so cleanly, and where he will begin to be prepared for contact with the world such as he will find it afterwards.

The actual experiences, as confessed by some of the upholders of parochial schools, that they were utterly disappointed; that they did no more than the church itself to serve the purposes for which it was created, might well deter the most devout adherents of the church. The Catholic population of the country is very varied as to nationality. There are Catholics of a foreign tongue. Most of the Catholics in this part of the country have come here speaking the same language that we speak; but there are vast multitudes, amounting to some millions of Catholics, principally in the West and Northwest, — in Wisconsin, Minnesota, Ohio, Missouri, the great cities of Chicago, Cincinnati and St. Louis, — who desire actually to maintain separate church-schools, not so much for the sake of maintaining their own religion, as for the sake of maintaining a sort of distinct nationality from our American nationality, maintaining the German speech and the German nationality. A German pastor in New York city confessed to me that he had thus hoped that in a hundred years the language of the country might be German. I said, "Your intense desire for these parochial schools is that you want to perpetuate your language, and keep your people a distinct and peculiar people for several generations, — forever, if you can." He said, "Well, supposing we do? Small blame to us? Why should n't we? And besides, who knows what will be the language of this country a hundred years from now?" He said, "Pennsylvania is full of German people, and the great Northwest is almost entirely German." It is not. They form a dominant element in the Catholic church; but, all put together, and including all nationalities, the Catholics everywhere are a wretched minority, as a rule. So this poor man was flattering himself that in a hundred years, possibly, German might be the language of this country. And he said, "Great Britain is practically exhausted as a field from which emigrants can come to this country; but there are forty odd millions of Germans in Germany who will be pouring into this country by the hundreds of thousands every year." And I felt enough of the American in me to say, "Why, if by some miracle you could discharge upon these shores to-morrow the whole forty millions of your Germans, there is so much of the old Anglo-American in this country that your whole forty odd millions, in a generation, would be swallowed up and turned out Americans, in spite of you."

Now, I am glad to be able to inform you that the more sensible among these German pastors are actually confessing defeat. Even a bishop, full of antagonism, strange to say acknowledged to me defeat. He said, it is really very sad, very strange, that these young people of ours, educated in these parochial schools, are no good." They go out very poorly educated for battle with the world, and very speedily they are apt to be forced into an antagonism with the church that educated them, because of the miserable botch that was made of their education. They try to keep them goody-goody Catholics, but still worse and more to keep them Germans. They must be taught their religion through a German teacher, they must make their confession in the German language. It has gone so far that a professor in St. Louis actually boxed the ears of a pupil, in a German school, because he spoke the English language during play-time, saying to him, in the German speech, — when he had shown some little manliness, I suppose; asserting his rights, insisting upon his right to follow his own inclinations, "*Du bist ein American*," — a pardonable reproach to a boy that had had the rashness to resist the authority of the priest. "Thou art an American," because he had proved himself enough of an American to resist some injustice! Fortunately, I say, in spite of their fanatical efforts, they are signally failing. German Redemptorist priests in New York city have confessed the same thing to us, — that the very efforts they are making to keep them good Catholics are actually driving the children out of the Catholic church. The moment they go into American counting-houses and seek to earn their own living they find that they are handicapped. They do not speak the language of their native land correctly; they can write it but imperfectly. They are doing their thinking, largely, in a foreign tongue, and it will take them years and years to catch up with such an enormous start as those have obtained who were educated in the public schools.

Now I will say to these men, "Go into the public schools; and if you believe you have a divine mandate and promise of Christ's help in teaching your religion, what are you afraid of? But if you build a Chinese wall around you, in order to keep out the other denominations, how do you expect your influence to leaven the whole mass? Go into the whole world and preach your gospel, and, if there is anything in it, the world will accept it. You are almost confessing that you don't believe anything in it yourselves, when you have to keep believers, by poking their eyes out, from coming more into the experiences of the world."

It is practically the same thing which has compelled churchmen in so many places to substitute their interpretation of the Word of God for the real Word of God itself. At one time they were afraid of the solar system. To-day some are afraid of our American system. They were afraid of the solar system because it clashed with their idea of the Word of God; and to-day, with the same narrow-mindedness, they are afraid to breathe the free air of America, while, if they were wise, they would soon find that nothing can be better for their religion than to accept the American idea of separation of church and State. They should remember the experiences elsewhere that have resulted in the enslavement and corruption of the church; and, taught by a painful history, by the long-suffering of men from "authority" so many centuries, surely they should find that they stand on a new continent, in this atmosphere of freedom, and ask nothing but a fair field and no favor. [*Applause.*]

I quite agree with all that Mr. Savage has said, and what he said ought to be a sufficient argument against the alleged immorality of the public schools. There is no good reason why men could not get together and agree upon a code of ethics that might not offend in the least degree any man who believes in God or who doesn't believe in God, in which Protestants, Roman Catholics, Jews, and in fact every respectable citizen, could cheerfully concur. And while I may differ somewhat from the gentleman in what he said in regard to universal ethics, surely I think we ought to agree, by unanimous consent, upon some code of ethics that could be taught the children. It is the duty of the State to educate its citizens, just as it is the duty of the family to educate its children. A man is born as much a member of

society as of his own family; and it is not merely a right but a duty of the State to supplement the work of the parent, to see that the parent fulfills his duty, — and, on neglect thereof, to fulfill it for him.

It is the right of the State, therefore, to educate; but in what? In things which are common, and in which all can cheerfully agree. Why cannot we see that there are certain principles of morality about which there is no dispute; and if there are remoter questions, about which there is dispute, let us agree to differ, and refrain from putting them into the public schools. If we find that we are treading on delicate ground, let them be omitted. In regard to certain portions of history, it can be stated that it was alleged so and so. Those who would force into the public schools their religion, who insist that we must have the Lord's Prayer, and perhaps some hymn sung, at the opening of the school, are the worst enemies of the public school. [*Applause.*] Those who would be up in holy horror at the positive teaching of any distinctive Catholic doctrine in any school-book, and yet at the same time insist upon teaching so as to give a Protestant flavor to it, are the worst enemies of the public schools. If we are to have public schools they must be common, and have nothing to do with those questions which are dividing the people. Therefore let us have the highest regard for the individual opinions of the people on the subject of religion, rather than alienate them from the public schools, to which we should be eager to attract them by making them so superior to the private schools in every respect that the latter would have to go to the wall. We must respect the liberty of parents to patronize parochial schools if they want to; but we surely have a right to demand, in the interests of the State, that a certain minimum standard of education shall be reached by the children, whether it be in a private or public school.

It strikes me that if the people would only agree upon these views, we would have no more school-questions. It is hardly to be considered, however, that our Catholic priests will to-morrow change their policy. Yet I am convinced that they will be driven into changing it, sooner or later, by the rebellion of their own Catholic people. The Catholic father will assert his right to decide in reference to parochial schools. The Catholic father will say, "I have the best right to decide as to the education of my children. I am more solicitous for the welfare of my children than you are. I am as anxious to have them good children as you can be. At the same time, I judge that the secular training in your schools is inferior. I know that this or that teacher is inadequate. I know that your chief concern, after you have obtained all the money that you can from your parish, is to administer as good an education as you can for the price that you are able to pay." It has become such a farce in New York that one of our schools has tried to get teachers at ten or twelve dollars a month, and young girls who may be willing to go and teach for pin-money. That kind of education is apt to be worth just about what it costs. A cheap article is apt to be a poor article. It is the policy of the public schools to give good salaries, in order to command the best services in return.

Never fear, then, for the future of the public schools. Do your duty and make them as good as you can, and, in spite of the bishops and priests, sooner or later the Catholic children will have to go to them. And I, as a Catholic priest, deplore the fatal policy that is sure to drive hundreds and millions of people out of the Catholic church, because of this undue interference with the rights of the fathers and mothers in the matters of their own children; because of this injustice that is done to them by inflicting an inferior education upon them in the name of God. It will result as other similar policies resulted in Europe, where the church, instead of minding her own business, has endeavored to control politics as well as religion.

The Chairman: — I will now give notice that the afternoon session of the Convention will be held in this hall at 3 o'clock, the subject being "Nationalism or Socialism." The first speaker will be Mr. Edward Bellamy, the author of "Looking Backward." The subsequent speakers will be the Rev. W. D. P. Bliss, the founder of the Society of Christian Socialists and the editor of their new journal, *Dawn;* Mr. Wm. Lloyd Garrison, who has needed no introduction for half a century; the Rev. N. P. Gilman, author of a recent work on Profit Sharing; and the Rev. Frederick A. Hinckley, of Northampton, who for years has been well known as a labor-reformer.

The session of the morning has been so long and so absorbingly interesting, and the audience has been so attentive, that the Chairman proposes to cut off all other speakers, including himself. He trusts that the audience has sufficient confidence in him to believe that a Chairman who can go beyond the speakers on the platform and extract from the audience itself two such addresses as those of Dr. McGlynn and Dr. Hamilton, could bring out an equally good speech from any one in the building, even himself. But he will forego that great pleasure, and declare the meeting adjourned until 3 o'clock.

AFTERNOON SESSION.

ADDRESS OF COL. HIGGINSON.

Ladies and Gentlemen:

From the origin of this organization we have tried sincerely to make thought and action go together, and in all our meetings to give due reflection not only to the principles of large thinking, but to the necessary action for the times and for the ages. The question we handled this morning is one that has been lately urged upon this city and upon this State, and, in a degree, upon the nation. The question that we are to take up this afternoon is one which is pressing not alone upon the city, the State, and the nation, but on the civilized and even the uncivilized world. The time has come when thinking men can no longer resist the conviction that beyond all the philanthropies of the age, all the unorganized and the organized philanthropy, there is still a vast residuum of poverty, of suffering, of moral evil, which none of these organizations, nor all combined, can even begin to reach; and it is coming to be believed that, in spite of the great social changes which the past has seen, there may yet be impending over the world changes in our social structure so important, so far-reaching, and perhaps so gradual, that the change from feudalism into the modern world, the change from slavery to freedom in Russia or America, can hardly exceed them in importance.

The questions that are being pressed upon us now touch the fundamental principles of poverty, of labor, of the soil. They come to all of us in different ways. Each gets his own suggestion, his own point of departure, and is set thinking. I remember well when, nearly twenty years ago, I stood for the first time on the soil of Europe, and saw my first ruined abbey and climbed my first ruined castle. As I passed up the crumbling stone steps, worn almost through, here and there, by the steps of successive generations; as I felt my reading of history summed up in a moment, and for the first time the Feudal period made real, — I said to myself, What changes can ever come to correspond to what the past has seen? But when I stood upon the top-stones of that castle, — it was the little, old, picturesque Ross Castle, on the Killarney Lakes, — when I looked upon that garden of the world, and thought that every inch of land I had seen in that day's journey was

the property of two men, Lord Kenmare and Herbert of Muckross, each of whom was said to make it his boast that nothing should induce him to part with one inch of the land! — when I saw that beautiful spectacle clouded by the abject thought that there was not a man, woman or child within the range of my vision whom either of those two men could not evict and turn off into the sea the next day if he wished to make his property into a deer-park, then it dawned upon me, as never before, that the future yet had changes as great as any that the past had seen; and I made then and there the discovery that the earth belongs to the race of man. [*Applause.*] All the great changes that might be necessary to bring about the recognition of that thought were very dim in my mind; they still remain in many respects dim and demand a somewhat distant future for their fulfillment. Some light has been thrown here and there by Henry George, some light has been thrown here and there by Edward Bellamy; light comes upon us in fragments, in single stray beams only; and after all, my greatest debt of gratitude to both those men is not that they have handled this vast problem wisely or unwisely, but that they have had the courage to handle it at all [*applause*]. It is in the knowledge that all speculation on such subjects, as to the nationalization of the land, as to the nationalization of labor, are necessarily tentative, fragmentary, initiatory, — it is in that knowledge that we have come together at this session of the Free Religious Association, have invited friends here representing different aspects of this great truth and asked them to tell us what they can tell, that we ourselves in our own thought may put their suggestions together and draw our own conclusions. First among these speakers is naturally that man who, still in youth, has lit upon a treatment of fiction which ennobles fiction, has brought to bear the imaginative power which we all knew he possessed already to the solution of problems which are worth more than any feats of imagination to him; and it is with a deep sense of admiration, both as a literary man and as a reformer, for the man who can thus, having tasted of his own power in literature, subordinate that power to a moral purpose which makes for him all literary successes trivial, — it is in that sense of admiration and regard that I introduce to you as the first speaker, Mr. Edward Bellamy.

ADDRESS OF EDWARD BELLAMY.

Ladies and Gentlemen:

When Rome was the world's center it used to be said that all roads led to Rome; so now, when the burden upon the heart of the world is the necessity of evolving a better society, it may be said that all lines of thought lead to the social question. For the sake of clearness, however, I shall this afternoon take up but a single thread of a single line of argument, namely, the economic. I shall speak of the present tendency to the concentration of the industrial and commercial business of the country in few and constantly fewer hands. The "Trust," or "Syndicate," in which this tendency finds its fullest expression, is recognized as one of the most significant phenomena of the day.

In seeking a comparison for the bewildering effect produced by the appearance of the Trust above the business horizon, one can only think of the famous comets of past centuries and the terrors their rays diffused, turning nations into flocks of sheep and perplexing kings with fear of change. The advent of the Trust marks a crisis more important than a hundred presidental elections rolled into one; — no less a crisis, in fact, than the beginning of the end of the competitive system in industry. And the end is going to be rather near the beginning. It is in vain that the newspapers sit up nights with the patient and the legislatures feed it with tonics. It is moribund. The few economists who still seriously defend the competitive system are heroically sacrificing their reputations in the effort to mask the evacuation of a position which, as nobody knows better than our hard-headed captains of industry, has become untenable.

Surely there have been few, if any, events in history on which the human race can be so unreservedly congratulated as the approaching doom of the competitive system. From the beginning, Christianity has been at odds with its fundamental principle — the principle that the only title to the means of livelihood is the strength and cunning to get and keep. Between Christianity and the competitive system a sort of *modus vivendi* has indeed been patched up, but Christianity has not thriven upon it, and the friends of Christianity are to-day vigorously repudiating it. As for the humane and philanthropic spirit, it has always found itself set at naught, and practically dammed up, by a system of which sordid self-seeking is so absolutely the sole idea that kindliness, humanity and generous feeling simply will not mix with it, while charity deranges the whole machine.

The final plea for any form of brutality in these days is that it tends to the survival of the fittest; and very properly this plea has been advanced in favor of the system which is the sum of all brutalities. But the retort is prompt and final. If this were indeed so, if the richest were the best, there would never have been any social question. Disparities of condition would have been willingly endured, which were recognized as corresponding to virtue or public service. But so far is this from being the case that the competitive system seems rather to tend to the survival of the unfittest. Not that the rich are worse than the poor, but that the competitive system tends to develop what is worst in the character of all, whether rich or poor. The qualities which it discourages are the noblest and most generous that men have, and the qualities which it rewards are those selfish and sordid instincts which humanity can only hope to rise by outgrowing.

But perhaps the explanation of the panic which the critical condition of the competitive system excites in some quarters, lies in a belief that whatever may be said as to the immoral aspects of it, it is nevertheless so potent a machine for the production of wealth as to be indispensable. If such a belief be entertained it is certainly the most groundless of superstitions. The problem before any system of national industry is to get the greatest result out of the natural resources of the country and the capital and labor of the people. In what way then, let us inquire, has the competitive system undertaken to solve this problem? It would seem a matter of obvious common sense that it should of course proceed upon some carefully digested and elaborated system of work to begin with. We should expect to see a close and constant oversight to secure perfect co-operation and co-ordination between all departments of work and all the workers. But in fact the competitive system offers nothing of the sort. Instead of a carefully digested plan of operation, there is no general plan at all; there are as many plans as there are workers, — some sixty millions. There is no general oversight even of an advisory sort. Every worker not only has his own plan but is his own commander-in-chief. Not only is there no co-operation between the workers, but each is doing all he possibly can to hinder those who are working near him. Finally, not only are they not working in co-operation, but they are not even working for the same end, — that is, the general wealth; but each to get the most for himself. And this he does, as frequently as not, by courses not only not contributory to the general wealth, but destructive of it.

If one of you should apply the same method of utter

planlessness, utter lack of oversight, utter lack of co-operation, to your own factory or farm, your friends would have you in an asylum in twenty-four hours, and be called long-suffering at that. Not a man in the country would undertake to cultivate a quarter of an acre, not a woman would undertake Spring cleaning, without more plan, more system for economy of effort, than goes to the management of the industries of the United States. How much more important is the business by which one man lives than that by which sixty million people live?

What in the name of common sense does competition mean, applied to business, but duplication? The only way, by its own confession, to get anything properly done is to have it done by somebody else, to divide the work of the first man with another man set to watch him, his again with a third man set to watch him, and so on indefinitely, on the principle that no business will be properly done till it has twice or thrice as many people engaged in it as are needed.

Under the competitive system cheapness can be produced only by waste. It is obvious enough that the cheapness here is only apparent. What we pay least for under this system in the end must cost most to the nation. Nothing indeed ought to surprise us in the absurdities of a scheme for undertaking the greatest piece of work in the world without plan or method. But what feature of the horrible mess could be more striking or more pathetic than the grotesque manner in which the burden of work is distributed. The industrial press-gang robs the cradle and the grave, takes the wife and mother from the fireside, and the old from the chimney-corner, while at the same time hundreds of thousands of strong men fill the land with clamors for an opportunity to work. The women and children are delivered to the task-masters, while the men can find nothing to do. There is no work for the fathers, but there is plenty for the babies. If only inhumanity were a substitute for intelligence, the present industrial system would be the completest success of history.

Why, then, this regret over the approaching doom of a system under which nothing can be properly done without doing it twice, which can do no business without overdoing it, which can produce nothing without overproduction, which in a land full of want cannot find employment for strong and eager hands, and finally which gets along at all only at the cost of a total collapse once in seven years, followed by a lingering convalescence?

What, in the name of wonder, is there about this same competitive system, — which appears to have been engendered between the adversary of souls and the demon of unthrift, and to favor its parents equally, — what is it about this most unsavory moribund, which should induce our newspapers to use valuable space in deploring its condition, and our law-makers to prescribe for it? When a bad king is mourned by his people, the conclusion must be that the heir to the throne is a worse case still. That appears to be, in fact, the explanation of the present distress over the decay of the competitive system. It is because there is fear of going from bad to worse, and that the little finger of combination will be thicker than the loins of competition; that while the latter system has chastised the people with whips, the Trusts will scourge them with scorpions. Like the children of Israel in the desert, this new and strange peril causes the timid to sigh even for the iron rule of Pharaoh. Let us see if there be not also in this case a promised land, by the prospect of which faint hearts may be encouraged.

Let us first enquire whether a return to the old order of things, the free competitive system, is possible. A brief consideration of the causes which have led to the present world-wide movement for the substitution of combination in business for competition, will surely convince any one that, of all revolutions, this is the least likely to go backward. It is a direct and inevitable result of the increase in the efficiency of capital in great masses, consequent upon the inventions of the last and present generations. In former epochs the size and scope of business enterprises were subject to natural restriction. There were limits to the amount of capital that could be used to advantage by one management. To-day there are no limits, save the earth's confines, to the scope of any business undertaking; and not only no limit to the amount of capital that can be used by one concern, but an increase in the efficiency and security of the business proportionate to the amount of capital in it. It must not be supposed that the principle of combination has been extended to those businesses only which call themselves Trusts. That would be greatly to underestimate the movement. There are many forms of combination less close than the Trust, and comparatively few businesses are now conducted without some understanding approaching to a combination with its former competitors, — a combination tending constantly to become closer.

From the time that these new conditions began to prevail, the small businesses have been disappearing before the larger; the process has not been so rapid as people fancy whose attention has but lately been called to it. For twenty years past the great corporations have been carrying on a war of extermination against the swarm of small industrial enterprises which are the red blood corpuscles of a free competitive system, and with the decay of which it dies. While the economists have been wisely debating whether we could dispense with the principle of individual initiative in business, that principle has passed away, and now belongs to history. Except in a few obscure corners of the business world there is at present no opportunity for individual initiative in business unless backed by a large capital; and the size of the capital needed is rapidly increasing. Meanwhile the same increase in the efficiency of capital in great masses, which has destroyed the small businesses, has reduced the giants which have destroyed them to the necessity of making terms with one another. As in Bulwer Lytton's fancy of the coming race, the people of the Vril-ya had to give up war because their arms became so destructive as to threaten mutual annihilation, so the modern business world finds that the increase in the size and powers of the organizations of capital, demands the suppression of competition between them, for the sake of self-preservation.

The first great group of business enterprises which adopted the principle of combining instead of competing, made it necessary for every other group sooner or later to do the same or perish. For as the corporation is more powerful than the individual, so the syndicate overtops the corporation. The action of governments to check this logical necessity of economical evolution, can produce nothing more than eddies in a current which nothing can check. Every week sees some new tract of what was once the great open sea of competition, wherein merchant adventurers used once to fare forth with little capital beside their courage and come home loaded, — every week now sees some new tract of this once open sea inclosed, dammed up, and turned into the private fish-pond of some syndicate.

I would also incidentally call your attention to the fact that these syndicates are largely foreign. Our new industrial lords are largely to be absentees. The British are invading the United States in these days with a success brilliantly in contrast with their former failures in that line. It is no wonder in these days, when the political basis of aristocracy is going to pieces, that foreign capitalists should rush into a market where industrial dukedoms, marquisates and baronies, richer than ever any king distributed to his favorites, are for sale. To say that from the present look of things the substantial consolidation of

the various groups of industries in the country, under a few score great syndicates, is likely to be complete within fifteen years, is certainly not to venture a wholly rash statement.

So great an economic change as is involved in taking the conduct of the country's industries out of a multitude of hands and concentrating them in the management of a few great Trusts, could not of course be without important social reactions; and this is a reaction which is going to effect peculiarly what is called, in the hateful jargon of classes which we hope some day to do away with, the middle class. It is no longer a question merely for the poor and uneducated, what they are to do with their work; but for the educated and well-to-do, also, where they are to find business to do and business investments to make. This difficulty cannot fail constantly to increase, as one tract after another of this once open sea of competition is inclosed by a new syndicate. The middle class, the business class, is being turned into a proletarian class.

It is not difficult to forecast the ultimate issue of the concentration of industry if carried out on the lines at present indicated. Eventually, and at no very remote period, society must be divided into a few hundred families of prodigious wealth on the one hand, a professional class dependent upon their favor but excluded from equality with them and reduced to the state of lackeys, and underneath, a vast population of working men and women, absolutely without hope of bettering a condition which would year by year sink more and more hopelessly into serfdom.

This is not a pleasant picture, but I am sure it is not an exaggerated statement of the social consequences of the syndicate system carried out according to the plans of its managers. Are we going to permit the system so to be realized? Are we going to permit the American people to be rounded up, corralled and branded as the dependents of some hundreds of great American and English families? It is well never to despair of the Republic, but it is well to remember that republics are saved not by a vague confidence in their good luck, but by the clear vision and courageous action of their citizens.

What, then, is the outcome? What way lies the Promised Land which we may reach? for back to Egypt we cannot go. To return to the old system of free competition and the day of small things is not a possibility. It would involve a turning backward of the entire stream of modern material progress.

If the nation does not wish to turn over its industries — and that means its liberties as well — to an industrial oligarchy, there is but one alternative; it must assume them itself. Plutocracy or Nationalism is the choice which, within ten years, the people of the United States will have virtually decided on.

Pray observe, ladies and gentlemen, that your argument is not with me, or with those of us who call ourselves Nationalists. We are not forcing upon you this alternative. The facts of the present state and tendency of national affairs are doing it. Your controversy is with them, not with us. Convince yourself and your friends that this talk about the invasion and appropriation of the field of general business by Trusts and Syndicates is all nonsense; satisfy yourselves from a careful study of the news of the day that there is really no tendency toward the consolidation in the hands of a comparatively few powerful organizations of the means of the nation's livelihood, and you can afford to disregard us entirely. Nothing is more certain than that we cannot make a revolution with mere words, or unless the facts are with us. Once admit, however, that the Trusts and Syndicates are facts, and that business is rapidly being concentrated in their hands, and if you do not propose to submit to the state of things which these admitted facts portend, you have no choice but to be Nationalists. The burning issue of the period now upon us is to be, is already' Plutocracy against Nationalism. In its fierce heat the ties of old party allegiances are destined erelong to dissolve like wax.

There have been many movements for a nobler order of society which should embody and illustrate brotherly love, but they have failed because the time was not right; that is to say, because the material tendencies of the age did not work with the moral. To-day they work together. To-day it matters little how weak the voice of the preacher be, for the current of affairs, the logic of events, is doing his work and preaching his sermon for him. This is why there is ground to-day for a higher-hearted hope that a great deliverance for humanity is at hand than was ever before justified. When sun and moon together pull the sea, a mighty tide is sure to come. So to-day, when the spiritual and the economic tendencies of the time are for once working together; when the spirit of this age, and the divine spirit of all ages, for once are on the same side, hope becomes reason, and confidence is but common sense.

In coming now to speak briefly of Nationalism and what it means, I should say that while the economic movement is greatly hastening the nationalization of industries, that result will belong strictly to another line of evolution,— the political. That is to say, the National idea,— which is that of the union of a people to use the collective strength for the common protection and welfare, — distinctly and logically involved from the beginning the eventual nationalization of industry and the placing of the livelihood of the people under the national guarantee. If this be the true conception of a nation, then how preposterous is the notion that the mere exclusive possession, as against foreign nations, of a tract of land, in any true sense constitutes nationality. The house-lot is not a house. Such a community has merely secured a place on which to build a nation, that is all. The nation may be built or not. If it is built, it will consist in a social structure so roofed over and meetly joined together, and so arranged within in all details, as to provide in the highest possible degree for the happiness and welfare of all its people. Where are any such nations? You may well ask. And I reply that there are none, and never have been any. We consider that the time is now arrived for building such nations, and that the first such nation will be built in America. We call ourselves Nationalists because we have faith in this true nation that is to be, and have given our hearts and our allegiance to it while yet it is unborn.

The fact that the use of the collective power for the common benefit was first made in protecting the people in war, arose from the fact that the first necessity of every community, the condition of its further development, was protection from external foes. On the other hand, let it be observed that the only object of this protection from external interference was to provide the opportunity for internal development, — that is, for building the social structure. It is thus self-evident that no nation has an excuse for existing at all, in which this process of internal social evolution is not going on. The shell of the egg is necessary to protect the vital principle within, during the process of evolving to a complete life. That is its only use. A nation which, having perfected its external organization, stops short there, has failed of the object of its existence, and can be compared to nothing more savory than an addled egg.

Consider the consequences which have followed the arrest of the development of the national idea at the point of division between the foreign relations of the people and their internal affairs. In war, the nation is the champion and the vindicator, against the world, of the rights of persons and property of its humblest citizen. But let peace come,

and this great archangel shrinks to the stature and functions of a policeman. Do you protest in indignation against such an incongruity? do you represent that, in one week, the sufferings of citizens from the oppressions, cruelties and maladjustments of industries exceed in quantity and poignancy all that the nation has ever suffered from foreign foes in its whole history? You will be told in reply that this is all quite as it should be. It will be explained to you that the nation has no business at all to concern itself for the welfare of its people, except as and when that welfare may be threatened by foreigners. It has no business to take cognizance of any trouble its people may be in, much less to take steps to remedy it, unless it can be shown to be the result in some way of foreign aggression. If a citizen desires the nation to take an interest in his welfare it is of no use at all for him to stay at home and suffer. The nation will not regard such sufferings. It is far-sighted, and can only see the afflictions of its people when they are a great way off. If the citizen would know how dear he is to the nation, let him go to the ends of the earth and get some foreigner to abuse him. Then indeed will he be astonished to find how devoted to his rights and his welfare his countrymen are. The very nation which, so long as he staid at home, did not care a pin whether he starved or lived, will incontinently, and without even stopping to find out whether he is in the right or not, enthusiastically sacrifice a hundred thousand soldiers, and double the national debt in his behalf.

May it not well be asked if mankind is, in any other respect, the victim of a theory at once so preposterous and so tragical in its consequences as this which limits the nation's guardianship of its people to their protection from foreigners? Is it any wonder that there should have arisen a sect of social reformers, under the name of Internationalists, who protest that the national organizations do but cumber the ground and block the progress of humanity? What is the use, may indeed be asked, of national distinctions, if they only fence off different sets of people to be fleeced and exploited separately? As well make the world all one pen, and save the expense of forts, fleets and armies. Nationalists, on the other hand, while admitting that the nations stand utterly condemned by their failure in the premises, yet maintain that through and by the nations, when they shall be aroused to assume and discharge their full responsibility for their people, is to come the deliverance of man.

We seek the final answer to the social question not in revolution but in evolution; not in destruction, but in fulfillment,— the fulfillment of the hitherto stunted development of the nation according to its logical intent.

We hear much of the duty of the citizen to the country. We cannot hear too much of that, but it is time something were also said of the duty of the country to the citizen. We are taught, and taught rightly, that it is the duty of the people to die for the nation in war. Is it not time we heard something of the duty of the nation to keep the people from starving in peace? Are not these obligations properly to be regarded as reciprocal? Truly it appears to me that the account between this nation and its people shows the nation most grievously in debt to the people.

Yesterday was celebrated the sacred civic festival of our American year. As we laid the garlands upon the graves of our heroes, the memory of the day came freshly to our minds when they went forth to battle at the call of the country. We saw them turn away from wife and sweetheart, and from the dear kisses of their little ones, — from the embraces of those who would die for them, — to die for the country; gladly giving their hearts' blood to cement her walls; eagerly proffering their tender bodies for her living barricade. How then has the country deserved, and how does she repay, this incredible devotion? this worship which the gods might envy? this tenderness which is not given to women?

Surely we may reasonably expect to find that the country cares well for such devoted citizens, and for their women and children, and that, in all ways in which the collective might can support, protect and sustain them, it is employed to those ends. No doubt she sees to it that the workers who feed the world are not rewarded with oppression, but are at least guaranteed absolute security in their portion of the livelihood they create for all. To the sick, weak, and infirm, and those who have no helper, we shall surely find the nation to be as the shadow of a great rock in a weary land. To the women, the nation is doubtless careful to lend of its mighty strength, that thereby they may be borne up, and not fall beneath the feet of their strong brothers; while as for the children — surely for them the nation reserves its peculiar tenderness and most vigilant watch-care. In these ways at least, as well as in a thousand others, we may confidently expect to find the nation using its strength to safeguard the people who in time of need so heroically succor it.

But no; not the least of these functions of justice, oversight, sustenance, and protection, do we find even an attempt to execute. The nation sits on high, indifferently looking on, while the people rend one another in a brutal and merciless struggle for existence, in which the weak, the old, the sick, are trampled under foot. Serenely the nation looks on, while little children are driven to toil; while armies of women sell themselves for bread; while the sick and the old suffer want till the clods of the valley seem sweet to them, and the earth is sodden with the tears of the widow and fatherless; while education becomes the privilege of the rich, work of the fortunate, and ignorance and poverty brood over the face of the land like a dense cloud, forbidding the light of the sun and the consolation of the stars to those who toil beneath.

Why then, since this is so, do not the people revile the country when she cries for help? How shall their passionate loyalty to a nation so ungrateful be accounted for? Were those heroes, whose graves we decorated yesterday, victims of some strange madness such as has led men before in frenzy to sacrifice themselves to senseless idols? Not so. We are here come, rather, to a sacred mystery. The instinct of patriotism, like the instinct of maternity, is prophetic, and looks to the future, not the present, for its full vindication. The impulse that prompts the mother to sacrifice her life for the child as yet not even able to understand her love, is implanted to the end that men worthy of sacrifice and capable of gratitude may later stand on the earth. So the instinct of patriotism,— with difficulty to be reconciled with reason while yet the nation so utterly fails to discharge a nation's responsibilities, — will be abundantly justified when the nation shall at last awake to them. In that day it will appear that the heroes who died that the nation might live did even better than they knew. In that day their sacrifice will be justified, and extolled in the eyes of all; their graves will blossom anew with the redoubled gratitude of men, and the spirits of the patriotic dead of all generations will see of the travail of their souls and be satisfied.

THE CHAIRMAN: — *Ladies and Gentlemen:* The organization called Nationalism, as was indicated in the statement just made, grew out of the publication of Mr. Bellamy's book, "Looking Backward," and took its shape in some degree from that. There was, however, as I am informed, a tendency before the publication of that book to an organization in Boston looking in a somewhat similar direction, under the name of "Christian Socialism," — a name somewhat familiar in England in the same connection.

Here, as there, the movement towards Christian Socialism took its origin largely from the church, and I have to introduce to you this afternoon as its representative a well known clergyman of the Episcopal church in this city, the organizer, the chief organizer, if I am not misinformed, of the movement, and certainly an adequate representative of it, the Rev. Mr. Bliss, of South Boston.

ADDRESS OF REV. W. D. P. BLISS.

Mr. President, Ladies, and Gentlemen:

We have heard to-day of Nationalism from the founder of Nationalism; it is of the same theme, from a different standpoint, that I would treat in speaking of Christian Socialism.

And I can deem it no small privilege and no small honor to present this subject before the members of the Free Religious Association. It it is only to men free to think, free to act, free to dare, that Christian Socialism looks with any hope. Let a man by character, by inheritance, or by choice, be bound to a theology he dare not question, be tied to a creed he dare not challenge, be fettered by interests he dare not sever, and there is little prospect that he will follow with either Frederick Maurice or with Karl Marx. "He who begins by loving Christianity better than truth, will proceed by loving his own sect better than Christianity, and end by loving himself better than all"; — Christian Socialism holds this with immortal Coleridge, and knows no loyalty, in either economics or theology, superior to the loyalty to truth. Differing, perhaps, from the majority of this Association, both in my religion and my economics, I do not differ from you in my worship of free thought, of free speech, and freedom of private judgment.

I. WHAT IS CHRISTIAN SOCIALISM?

It is not what it was in the days of Maurice and Kingsley and the founders of Christian Socialism. Born in Utopia, it is not to-day Utopian. There is an evolution of Christian Socialism as well as an evolution towards Christian Socialism. Perhaps we may say that it is not what it was four years ago when the Rev. R. Heber Newton addressed this Association upon the Religious Aspect of Socialism. Socialism has made rapid advance these last four years, advance not only in extension and in general acceptation, but qualitatively, and in form. And so with Christian Socialism. It has conformed to Mr. Spencer's notes of life, in advancing from an incoherent and undetermined homogeneity, at least toward a more coherent and more defined heterogeneity. The official organ of the Christian Socialist Society in England declares that, "while maintaining the Christian spirit upon which the teachings of Maurice and Kingsley were based, it does not hesitate to advance the principles of Socialism with all the significance which has been added to that term by the economic investigations of such men as Ferdinand Lassalle, Karl Marx, and Henry George." And this too may be said of American Christian Socialism, except that we must add, the world will add, — nay, the world is adding, — the name of Edward Bellamy. But this means heterogeneity. Mr. Bellamy does not call himself a Socialist; Mr. George, if we are to accept his own statement, is not a Socialist. Christian Socialism, therefore, in accepting the principles of these different men, confesses at once that it has not yet arrived at perfect coherency and perfect definiteness of conception. Christian Socialism must yet be regarded with somewhat of a latitude of conception, — perhaps be regarded rather as the name of a tendency than of a detailed and developed conception of social order.

But at least it stands for thought, somewhat more definite, somewhat more determined then when it first arose. As Socialism has gone through the three stages of the Utopian, the experimental, the scientific, and has now reached a fourth stage, of scientific application, so Christian Socialism has gone through the two stages of the ideal and the experimental, represented by St. Simon, the vision-seer, and Maurice and Kingsley, the founders of Christian Socialism, and has now reached the scientific stage, best represented by the writings of Arnold Toynbee, in England, and by the Rev. R. Heber Newton of our own land. A dream, an attempt, a science; such has been the history of this as of many another movement. The dream of a St. Simon in his Neo-Christianity, you and I and our children are to realize in scientific applications; where Kingsley and Maurice and Hughes laid the foundation, you and I, by practical, careful deed, are to raise the battlements of God's kingdom. Christian Socialism is to-day not a Utopia, not an experiment; it is the scientific application of Christianity to the social organization and financial and industrial relations of mankind.

More specifically, — *First.* It is the application of *Christianity* to social order. All Christian Socialists agree in this. Differing in their view of Christ and their conception of Christianity, they are agreed that in some way we must apply to all our life's relations the spirit and the teachings of the Carpenter of Nazareth. From St. Simon, with his visionary Neo-Christianity, to Bishop Kettler of Mayence, the Bishop of the church of organized tradition; from Frederick Dennison Maurice, the "Master" of English Broad church Divinity, to Stuart Headlam, the plucky, Radical High Anglican modern priest, is in theology a long way, yet it is traversed by Christian Socialism, and all agree that we must apply the Sermon on the Mount and the spirit of the Cross to the market, the exchange, the manufactory, the halls of legislature. "O my Italy," cried Savanarola, "nothing can save thee but Christ"; and Christian Socialists of every land and every age would cry the same, interpreting, however, the Christ in different ways.

Secondly, Christian Socialism would apply its Christianity to the *social* order. It does not forget the individual; it does not oppose itself to true individuality; it believes rather that only through a rightly organized social state shall we reach the highest type of the individual. But nevertheless it believes that at present our pressing need is to affect the social order. Environment, Christian Socialism has learned to respect. It has sat at the feet of Darwin and of Spencer and of Huxley, as it has knelt before the throne of Christ. It has of them learned something of the power of environment. But it has learned by experience as well. It has been ever, in Maurice, in Kingsley, in Kettler, in Stuart Headlam, in James Huntington, in touch with the poor. It knows what a tenement is; it has visited the slum; it has listened to the Bitter Cry of the great city: it has seen the poor oppressed by their poverty, infants inheriting vice, children schooled in iniquity, young men and young maidens compelled to breathe a moral atmosphere polluted by every contamination. It has seen, as has been well pointed out, "not only the poverty of a generation, but generations of poverty." It has taken two score of generations to produce the English gentleman. Christian Socialism knows that it has taken those same generations to father the English navvy. England's aristocracy and England's slums are twin fruits of a single tree. Christian Socialism sees the impossibility, except in here and there a sporadic case, of lifting the individual to noble life in an environment of moral disease and contamination. What we need is not to improve the slum, but to abolish the slum; and that means to begin by the abolishment of many and many a palace of luxury and of selfishness and of wealth. What we need to do is not so much to change the habits of the poor, as to

change the habits of the rich. The way to improve East London lies through Buckingham Palace; the way to help the South End and the North End of our Boston lies — we say it frankly — in taxes upon Commonwealth Avenue. Under industrial competition, those who once get a successful start must, as a rule, go on making more money, for money breeds money. Christian Socialism, therefore, does not so much blame the rich as see in them the necessary and inevitable result of competition; and those who are to *blame* for present conditions are not the rich alone, but you and I, and all of us, who at least by silent acquiescence maintain the present system. Instead of the present industrial system, based upon unregulated competition, Christian Socialism, would place combination, Nationalism, — the municipality, the State, the nation owning, controlling, operating all business for the equitable good of every one.

But, *thirdly*, Christian Socialism believes only in a democratic, not a bureaucratic organization. If asked if Christian Socialism is State Socialism, the answer must be that that depends on what you mean by the State. If you mean by the State, what Europe means, a governing machine to rule over people, neither Christian Socialists nor any Socialists are State Socialists. That is tyranny. Tyranny is not Socialism. To call even Bismark's paternal Imperialism Socialistic is an insult to every Socialist. But if, on the other hand, you mean by the State, a democracy, the people themselves, the people organized, Christian Socialists and all Socialists believe in this. We believe in fraternalism, not paternalism; we believe in rule but in self-rule. We believe in *Brother* Jonathan, more than in *Uncle* Sam.

Fourthly, Christian Socialists believe that this order must be developed from the inner, outward; not from the outer inward; we believe that systems are important aids, but only aids. With Lassalle, we hold that the spirit giveth life. Only we hold that those individuals who are touched with true spirit-life, must toil for true social order, true spirit in true system. Science and Christianity, we believe, unite to teach that there is a Social Law of God.

Lastly, Christian Socialists believe that this Divine economy can only be gradually, and step by step, attained. We do not believe in a flying leap into Paradise. We believe in evolution; through progression, digression and sometimes retrogression, all healthy, enduring natural growth must be expected. We believe in evolution because we believe in Him who is the Great Evolver. Step by step, day by day, year by year, we believe that God is bringing in the Kingdom of God on earth, the New Jerusalem, the State whose law is Love.

II. OBJECTIONS TO CHRISTIAN SOCIALISM.

First. It is ideal, unpractical; it takes no account of human nature; it might work in heaven, it can never work on earth.

We answer that it would work in heaven, and *therefore* it shall be upon this earth. What should be, shall be, though the centuries wait to convert the far ideal into the actually realized.

It is Utopian, unpractical to expect to leap into Nationalism to-morrow, but neither Nationalists nor Socialists have any such expectation. They believe it to be simple duty, however, to steadily press toward it. And we are nearer it than we think. People say, *Combination* or *Competition.* That is not now the question. Combination has come, and come to stay. Capital *is* combined. Trusts are here and will not leave us. Names may change. Trusts may take Protean forms to avoid or to fulfill the requirements of the law; but combination will not down. Capitalists have learned the power of combination. The day of competition for capital is swiftly ending. The Standard Oil Company has taught the possibility, the practicability, the inner utility of far reaching and manifold combination. Capital is combined; but how about the people? The only question now is who shall combine, the capitalists or the people? As Mr. Bellamy has well pointed out, the only alternative now before us is a plutocracy or Nationalism. Here then comes in our Christianity. In these modern "Trusts" we have no faith; conceived in selfishness, born in blood-guiltiness, they live to-day in robbery and extortion. But nevertheless they show what can be done; they teach what we must do; they prove that Nationalism, if wisely managed and gradually developed, is not impractical. The Trust has taught us how we may look forward. What it has done for self, Christian Socialism proposes for humanity.

But, *secondly*, what enormous organizing and executive ability it would take. It may be mapped out in a novelist's brain, but who will trace the map in the intricacy of human life? "What man hath done, man can do"; let not any Anglo-Saxon talk of failure in organization and execution. The marvels of the Nineteenth Century can presage the wonders of the Twentieth. And even to-day this very executive and organizing ability is being developed for us. We are *now* in the transitory state. This too the Trust is doing for us; the devil is harnessed to draw the plough of God.

Back of the Oil Monopoly, back of the Sugar Trust, back of the Railroad Pool, back of every combination, you will find some single brain. It does not always belong to the man who presides over the combination. It may be a power behind the throne — many a private secretary has done the thinking for his master — but *somewhere* there is that power. And this power, this ability, this planning, conceiving, executing brain, can do for man what now it does for money. Ability for self shall yet be used for man, shall yet be consecrated to the service of the world, to conceive, to develop, to realize the Co-operative Commonwealth.

But *thirdly*, when evolved, what a tyranny it will be. Dr. Harris tells that it will mean the "straight jacket" for us all; we hear from over the water strenuous warnings against "The Coming Slavery." It will mean in truth the very reverse of this, and experience is our proof. In the beginnings of civilization men were little better than the brutes. Warfare, physical warfare, was universal. Then as now, man's necessity was food, and to obtain this he struggled hand to hand, with physical force and combat. The straightest arrow and the strongest bow entitled to the best of hunting and the choicest fishing. It resulted in the survival of the strongest, while the physically weak were trampled to the ground.

When gradually, through the family, through the tribe, through the clan, through the race, nationality, law, order, government arose and put an end to physical competition, did individuality perish? I trow not; it simply developed a brighter type of individuality; and men, secure from physical violence, began to compete in thought, in invention, in discovery, in civilization. Individuality became not physical but mental. To-day men compete for food, not with physical weapons, but with mental cunning, shrewdness, trickery, push. These are weapons to-day. When Socialism brings in industrial organization, industrial law and order, will individuality perish? I trow not. It will simply develop a brighter type of individuality. To-day we have the Survival of the Pusher; we shall then have a more moral combination, with the Survival of the Noblest. Men certain of a competent livelihood by doing a moderate and equitable share of work, will have time and strength and opportunity for culture, for art, for education, for religion. Man then will be able to be that which his character fits him to be. No "mute, inglorious Milton" will then be

possible. We shall have a Twentieth Century Renaissance in Art, Revival in true Learning, true Reformation in Religion. Orthodoxy will be wed to Orthopraxy. While human nature lasts there will be competition, but not a low competitive struggle for butter and bread; rather, a noble ethical competition, — call it emulation, — an emulation between brother artists, brother workers, brother men; at last, an armistice divine, competition in good works,— that competition taught by the Great Brother. "If any man will be chief among you, let him be servant of all." This is the consecration of competition.

But, *fourthly*, is not this the poet's rapture and the dreamer's dream, the State "that never was on sea or land"? As a matter of hard fact, to descend to the earth that is, to return to the common light of every day, does not all experience testify that State enterprise is poor enterprise, expensive production, corruption and wire pulling? Can we afford to neglect the spur of private interest? We shall not neglect the spur of private interest. Under Socialism, as never before, it will be for the interest of every workman to do good work. The larger the product, the larger will be his share. The more cloth made, and the better cloth made, the more and better cloth will the weaver have to carry home to his children and his wife. Under the wage-system, the producer has but little interest in his production. Socialistic production gives an interest to all. Nor can we judge of government then, by what we have to-day! That is to judge the New Jerusalem by the lobby at Washington. What is it that corrupts government to-day? It is money, concentrated in the hands of a powerful minority, with the lack of money distributed through increasing masses of our population. This, together with our present system of appointment to government office, is manifestly the cause of corrupt government. Under Socialism, with money or the value of money equitably distributed, and with government democratically organized, with election to office proceeding from below up, and only a very limited use of the appointment power, there will be a government without the causes of present corruption. With political corruption, as with all the crying evils of the day,— intemperance, dissolution of the marriage-tie, etc.,— Christian Socialism deals by striking at the cause.

III. WHAT TO DO.

But how can we do this? Where shall we begin? How shall we move from the present actual to the far ideal? How shall the Looking Forward of 1889 become the Looking Backward of the year 2000?

Christian Socialists answer by *education*. Financial conditions, industrial development, the tendency of the times, all these we believe are fighting for us, but still education must be our one abiding, never changing trust. Educate, agitate, legislate: this is the program of all Socialists. Dynamite, ignorance, violence: so some still think of Socialism. But the only dynamite of Socialism is the dynamite of the printing-press; and the only red flag above our movement is the red school-house on the country hill and the red brick walls where our city children learn.

We want no flag, no flaunting rag,
For Liberty to fight;
We want no blaze of murderous guns
To struggle for the Right.
Our spears and swords are printed words,
The mind our battle-plain;
We've won such victories before,
And we shall win again.

We yield to none in earnest love
Of Freedom's cause sublime;
We join the cry Fraternity;
We keep the march of Time.
And yet we grasp not pike or spear,
Our victories to obtain;
We've won without their aid before
And we shall win again.

But more specific plans we have. The Christian Socialists of Boston are now organized; organized to educate, organized to agitate, organized to prepare for legislation. And specific plans they have. They propose, wherever it may be possible, to start Christian Economic Classes, for the *study* of social problems. Many desire this. They see that Christianity should be applied to business; they are coming to feel that in some way our present methods in business are not in perfect accord with the spirit of the New Commandment; they are becoming convinced that *some* change must be made, but they are not yet quite prepared to say what change; they desire further study, more light. For these, the Christian Socialists propose such Christian Economic Classes,— to commit the student to no position, to adopt no one study, simply to study the truth.* If Christian Socialism be not truth, Christian Socialists do not desire it.

Secondly, the Christian Socialist Society has started an organ,— *The Dawn*.† Working in perfect sympathy with the Nationalist Society and their magazine, as they strive to arouse the nation, *The Dawn* would especially strive to arouse the Christian Church. Socialists of all kinds believe in the power of the press. What were Socialism and where were Socialists, without the Socialistic press? *The Dawn* is open to all writers, of any religion or of any school of thought, for the discussion of the application of Christianity to social problems. Above all, it would chronicle the facts of the progress of Christian Socialism. It sees, in all facts, object-lessons of the Divine Teacher, God teaching by example. God is not dead. He is alive, creating to-day. *The Dawn* would herald the rising of the Sun of Righteousness with healing in His wings.

Thirdly, Christian Socialists look forward to the realization of their aims through the conscientious use of the ballot. They therefore favor and advocate all national, State, or municipal legislation looking towards the extension of democratic governmental control and ownership. Such measures as the municipalization of the supplying of light and heat, surface railroads, the nationalization of the telegraph and the railroads, before very long of the rivers, Christian Socialists favor as practical steps towards the coming order. Taxation of land held for speculative purposes as fully as of land in use, Christian Socialists believe should immediately be established.

But, *lastly and above all else*, Christian Socialists believe in holding this movement close to the religious life. They would ever be *Christian* Socialists. They do not mean by this so much the acceptance of any creed. Of any creed or no creed (it may be, even unknowing God, yet known of Him), they call them Christians who do the will, who live the life, who breathe the breath of Christ. To such they call. To sacrifice by sacrifice is their appeal. For country, for home, for humanity, for the world, let us strive! — this is the battle-cry of Christian Socialism. We do not look for selfishness to aid the cause of love. We would not raise the structure of God's kingdom upon foundation of enlightened self-interest. If any man knows nothing of the divine, Christlike enthusiasm for humanity, Christian Socialism has no hope from him. To adopt and to *adapt* the stinging words of Mr. Pentecost,—

We do not appeal to that portion of the rich (thank God, they are not all) who are incapable of understanding the

*For information as to the detailed plan for the formation and conduct of these classes, apply to the Secretary of the Christian Socialist Society, 36 Bromfield st., Boston.

†Published monthly by the Progress Publishing Co., 36 Bromfield st., Boston, price, 50 cents per year. Rev. W. D. P. Bliss, Editor; Associate Editors, Rev. O. P. Gifford, Mrs. Mary A. Livermore, Prof. Garland, Edward Bellamy, Rev. John Brown, Rev. R. Heber Newton, D. D., Rev. J. O. S. Huntington, Miss Frances E. Willard, Rev. W. E. Sillence.

situation, who are drunk with money distilled from the blood of the poor. We do not appeal to the very poor. They are past the power of feeling. Their brains are dead; their nerves are dying; they are chloroformed with poverty. We do not appeal to the politicians who are mad with the greed for office. We do not appeal to that portion of the press (thank God, a lessening portion) whose only God is Daily Circulation. We do not appeal to that portion of the clergy who are given up to dreams of another world and the enjoyment of this. We appeal to you who love your fellow-men, to you who love your fellow-men better than you love yourselves, to you who believe that what is right must be done though the earth split and the stars stagger in their courses, to you who think that justice needs no precedent, to you who are capable of moral enthusiasm, to you who never despair, but who have faith to believe that, though death catch you and hurry you away, yet will that which should be come to pass.

Christian Socialism appeals to the churched and the unchurched. The occasion demands it; the suffering summon, the rich have need; humanity calls. Thank God, the church is rising. Tolstoi in Russia, Toynbee Hall in London, Father McGlynn in New York city; voices in the Greek, the Anglican, the Latin Communions, all indicate the moving of the church. "Go ye into all the world, and preach the gospel to every creature" — what grander gospel, what diviner, truer, more Christly gospel, than the Fatherhood of God, the Brotherhood of Man. This is the message; this is the good news; — deliverance to the captive, the gospel to the poor, to heal the broken-hearted, to set at liberty them that are bruised; — let the church preach indeed the acceptable year of the Lord. This is the church's duty, not to preach political economy, but to preach the application of Christianity to political economy. Let the church do this. If, with Father McGlynn, — that God-called priest, whom neither pope nor any man can drive out from the natural priesthood of humanity, — the church take up the cross of the New Crusade, let her see well to it that it does not degenerate into a mere fiscal reform, as seems too much to have been the fate that has overtaken the men of the Single Tax. If, with Mr. Bellamy, the church read "Looking Backward," let her not forget to look ever back to Him who, eighteen hundred years ago, was the first Christian Socialist. If the church follow with Karl Marx, let her only follow him because she first followed Jesus Christ. Let us be Socialists because we are Christians, and then be better Christians because we are Socialists. For humanity let us toil, for humanity let us sacrifice, because we follow Him who speaketh from the cross. Because we are Christians, let us also dare to be the despised, the humane, the scientific, the self-sacrificing Socialists.

After the address of Mr. Bliss, a short recess was taken, after which the Chairman introduced the next speaker as follows:

I shall have the honor of introducing to the audience as the next speaker one of our own fellow-citizens who inherits a great historic name which he has kept untarnished. I have the pleasure of presenting Mr. Wm. Lloyd Garrison.

ADDRESS OF WM. LLOYD GARRISON.

It would be impossible not to admire the spirit and sympathize with the noble aims of Mr. Bellamy, and any criticism of his methods must concern itself with their practical adaptation to the end in view — that ideal state of society for which thinkers in all ages have sought in vain "and died without the sight." Yet our ideas of that desired state must differ as do our ideas of Heaven, and we picture it as variously as we do our gods. So I confess with diffidence that the Boston which seems so fascinating to a multitude, in the pages of "Looking Backward," did not allure me. I am not sorry to escape its imprisonment. In some respects but little progress seemed to have been made. The wine-cup and the cigar still filled the social foreground, as in the times of Howells and James, and woman, obedient to bad custom, still retired from the table because the decanter and the Havanas were reached. But generally life seemed to me there to lack the flavor which makes it tolerable. It recalled the marionette exhibitions which charmed my youth, where the figures dressed and acted with propriety, but obedient to the hand and strings behind the scenes.

As Sydney Smith affirmed that the two women disputing across the fence which separated their back yards would never come to an agreement, because they argued from different premises, so here we must consider the ground each stands on.

Mr. Bellamy starts with the assumption that competition is the root of social evil. My premise is that the denial of free competition is the source of social wrong. How then shall we begin to argue? As man existed before society, we must reason from the unit, which is the individual, up to human government, which, in its highest type, is the voluntary association of individuals for the protection of the rights of all. DeFoe has given us, in Robinson Crusoe, the picture of the isolated man. He is the monarch of the realm, subject only to the laws of nature. No statute is necessary to him. He would have no use for Mr. Bellamy's scheme. Now when Friday becomes an inhabitant of the island, and brings his kinsman later, conditions are modified. In equity, Crusoe's personal liberty is limited at the point which intrenches on Friday's rights; but if, following the action of mankind in nation-building hitherto, he had said, "This island is mine, and my will is law," Friday would have been only a slave. And thereafter, any accession of population would have added subjects to the despotic sway of Crusoe and his lineal successors. Thus unconsciously all despotisms have been founded, based on might or advantage of possession, and justified by the assumption that the individual is incompetent to care for himself and that some external and paternal direction is essential. With this belief excellent men have filled the role of tyrant and inquisitor, using the medicine of the prison-cell, the axe, and the scaffold, for the patient's good. Repression has been the law and made the laws. The statute-books of the most civilized governments are but the heirlooms of the Dark Ages, and legislation is to-day chiefly concerned with modifying and repealing ancient edicts. By these, woman is still restrained from her God-given rights, and begs for equality at the hands of her selfish brothers. By these, the natural right of man to exchange freely the product of his labor where he can benefit most, is denied him, and the United States, which claims to set an example of justice to the world, elects a President on the sole issue that the wrong shall be perpetuated. By these edicts the earth, which is the bounty of the Creator and the necessity of man, is seized and monopolized by force and cunning, the wrong buttressed by legal forms at war with natural justice. The world is too much governed. The race is not to the swift nor the battle to the strong, but to the crafty, and statutes adroitly devised hedge in monopolies as if they were divinities. The resultant misery and inequality that curse mankind through loss of freedom, are adduced by the State socialist as a reason for more government. The patient must be cured by a hair of the dog that bit him.

To this has paternalism led us. It paralyzes the desire to excel, it hangs out no prizes of life to stimulate energy and righteous ambition, it exalts mediocrity, it tends not "to lift mortals to the skies" but "to drag angels down."

Do not understand me to assert that Mr. Bellamy or his disciples desire anything of the kind. Far from it. But it

seems to me that the governmental assumption of business enterprises which they encourage, and the arbitrary regulation of individual life, are a return to that despotism from which humanity has been struggling to free itself since civilization began.

The individualist looks back to Robinson Crusoe's island, and pictures a government born under the instincts of true liberty. He recognizes the necessity for human government, or association for protection, but to what end? That man may be guaranteed the natural right to the use of the bounties of creation, to the selection of the occupation that his instinct may designate, and that the right to life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness be not interfered with. Only one proviso is necessary: — that in his pursuit of these desirable things he shall in no way infringe upon the right of his fellows engaged in the same pursuit. The greater the simplicity of government, the larger the liberty of the individual; and under the development of freedom come the most bountiful results. A true government does not contemplate compassing what the Creator himself found impossible, — an equality of individual gifts. Its function is to furnish simply an equality of opportunity, leaving each the result of his energy, skill, self-denial, foresight and industry. It seeks not equality of condition, but conditions that shall give labor its just rewards, be they much or little. People who need the most government are the ignorant and depraved. Who need the least? The people of enlightenment and conscience. Given a community of Edward Bellamys, and each man would be a law unto himself, and the costly and oppressive paraphernalia of government would be reduced to a minimum. And now with growing wisdom and conscience we are asked to increase the powers of government! The idealist has always looked forward to that time when, instead of the iron hand of authority, government would be typified by the silken cord of brotherly association.

"Exactly what we aim at," says the Nationalist. But how does he propose to reach it? You will agree that no ideal government exists to-day. It is of the earth, earthy. Its methods are sinuous, its principles false; it is ingeniously fashioned to thwart the will of the majority. The few govern, the many are misgoverned and witless enough to suppose they make the laws. Therefore venality is respectable, selfishness is the guiding policy, high-mindedness and sensitive public honor in politics are food for public mirth. Jobbery lurks in legislatures and aldermanic boards, and wealth which results from public plunder is all-abounding. This is no exaggerated description of existing government. What think you, therefore, of the wisdom of putting into the hands of such an organization further opportunities of appropriating for private use the people's earnings? It opens opportunities for wealth to the self-seeker "beyond the dreams of avarice."

When I read the Nationalist's programme I am obliged to infer a supreme and perfect government upon which these immense duties are to devolve. Omnipotence only can fill the necessary conditions. For, let the wisest man try for a single day to regulate the provisions of a single city, and either a famine or a glut must follow. But, left simply to the individual, guided by self-interest, which is as divine an instinct as that of the desire to live, and the unhindered law of supply and demand measures to a pound the necessary supply of meat and vegetables and groceries demanded by the vast city of New York, with its population suddenly doubled in Centennial days. The natural laws, made by the only omnipotence possible, may always be trusted to do their perfect work; but let man undertake to put his hand upon the machinery, to alter this law and amend that, and there follow the confusion, disaster, misery and death, which inflict society on its present basis.

"But," says the Nationalist, "you Individualists are inconsistent. You occupy part of our ground, but lack the logic and the courage of your convictions. If you are agreed that the land should be nationalized, that railroad franchises should not be alienated to individual ownership, that water and light may be supplied by municipal governments, why pause there? Why not allow woolen and cotton mills, and dry-goods stores, to be under public management?"

Yet a clearly defined line separates the first from the last, and in both cases the protection of individual right is the sole purpose to be attained. The object of land nationalization is to prevent comparatively few people from monopolizing a natural gift of the Creator to the exclusion of human beings who have an equal right to its opportunities. And railways, water and gas supplies, and cognate industries, are dependent for existence on the occupying of common possessions, the use of which should bring a recompense not to individuals but to the community. At present all citizens are taxed to build and maintain streets and highways, one of the largest items of municipal expenditure. They are the public property; but great corporations find no difficulty in getting for nothing the franchise whose value is created by the people's money. The same reasoning applies to the supply of light and water and sewerage, because the use of the streets is essential to their operation. This is simply upholding the law of equal freedom, which is the chief function of government.

But regarding the manufacture of woolens and cottons, and the vending of goods, how different is the case? As far as any of these are dependent on common property for existence, like land and water-power, it is just that they should pay the community for use; but beyond that, the product of industry (not injurious to public health and morals) is something that is the sacred property of the individual, as much as the right of personal liberty, out of which it logically grows. It is the liberty to enjoy and dispose of the fruits of one's toil unhindered by the interference of governments, which, truly administered, are but for the very purpose of protecting this liberty.

I deny the right of legislation to arbitrarily take the earnings of the industrious to supply the needs of the idle; to rob the thrifty for the sake of the spendthrift, and, under the guise of benefiting the country, grant licenses to one set of men to prey upon the community through tariff taxes. The proposal to limit individual wealth, provided it is accumulated without injustice to others, is no more reasonable than to propose the limitation of the human voice or the inventive genius that gives us Edisons and Ericssons. Is wealth an evil? Nay, it is a good. We cannot have too much of it. When not dammed up by special laws but allowed to flow by the beneficent law of gravitation over the broad meadows of humanity, it fertilizes and blesses all. It brightens toil, increases leisure, permits the cultivation of the higher faculties, and differentiates civilization from barbarism. It was considered extravagant in Henry George to say that the liberation of land would tend towards furnishing women with pianos and a trip to Europe; but it is certainly more in the line of progress and aspiration than Mr. Atkinson's cooker and ten cents a day.

Through liberty only can humanity find hope and courage, and upon this line alone it moves to the idealist's goal. How many crimes are perpetrated in its name! And it is murder in the house of its friends that may be rightly feared from State socialism. And we are begged to reverse the current. We are asked to magnify the tool of government at the expense of the governed, although ostensibly for their sake; — itself only a temporary scaffolding for the building of the temple of God.

Attractive as the pen of fiction may paint the picture,

"it leads to bewilder and dazzles to blind." Be not misled, but join with those who have not to transform human nature to succeed, but are busy clearing the obstructed track of progress upon which society shall roll triumphant towards that divine goal, which the Individualist and the Nationalist alike desire.

THE CHAIRMAN:—I am sure we have all heard with great interest Mr. Garrison's courageous statement, but you must pardon me if I say that at one point he seemed to me to trifle with the experience of human suffering. I do not mean that point at which he stated as a general fact that very few of us had too much wealth, which I dare say is true, but when he declares as a fact in political economy that most of those who went to New York at the time of the Centennial got a sufficient dinner to eat. That I think was false to your experience if you went there, and trifling with human sorrow.

It cannot be denied that this afternoon, as this morning, the Free Religious Association, after its own fashion, has presented a sufficient variety of opinions. That dates back, as I reminded you this morning, to the first meeting, when the young Andover student who was present returned to Springfield and reported that he had heard religion defined in five different ways. We are defining the movement in the direction of social reform in that number of different ways. We have now come to the fourth definition. That definition will be Profit-Sharing, and it will be treated by the man who, by the admission of the political economists, has made up to this time the most exhaustive study of that subject, Mr. N. P. Gilman.

ADDRESS OF REV. N. P. GILMAN.

Ladies and Gentlemen:

I THINK I see now, after Mr. Garrison's speech, why there was an intermission. It was to separate the believers from the heretics; for I am one of the heretics, if you judge me from the standpoint of the Nationalists or Christian Socialists. I do not wish to appear here this afternoon in any attitude of simple criticism, but I am not a follower of Henry George, I am not a follower of Mr. Bellamy, I am not a Christian Socialist. I wish to draw your attention to what I consider a very much more practical and feasible method than any which has yet been proposed by the Nationalists or the Christian Socialists or the followers of Henry George.

I will ask you first, ladies and gentlemen, to look backward with me forty-one years,—taking your stand in the present and looking back only forty-one years, to France.

In 1848, Louis Phillipe, the citizen king, was obliged to leave France. A provisional government was set up, and one of the first things which that government was called upon to do by the Communists of Paris was to establish the nationalization of industry. In accordance with the demands of the radicals of Paris a system of government workshops was established. The government granted $600,000 to start them. Fifty-six different co-operative societies received aid in that way, and at first the wages paid in those establishments was at the rate of one dollar a day. What was the result of this historical attempt to nationalize industry? In four months every one of those shops was closed. The government lost not only its $600,000 but ran three millions of dollars in debt. There was an uprising in the eastern part of Paris which had to be put down by troops, and wages, before the shops were closed, had to come down to twenty cents a day in the national workshops. We have here an historic experience of the nationalization of industry; and it has been pronounced, by every writer of French history and economic laws, a complete collapse, an utter failure.

Now, in 1848, when a new constituent to the Assembly was to be elected, the electors in one part of Paris brought forward a man by the name of LeClaire as the candidate for the Assembly. They said this: "We present LeClaire to you not as a man who is to nationalize industry and to organize labor on a new plan, and to regenerate the whole social order, but we will show you what he has done in his own business, in his own workshop, to bring together the employer and the employee." LeClaire issued his address. I should say that he was a painter and decorator, in Paris; that he employed at that time some three hundred painters, and that he stood in the foremost rank of his craft in Paris. He said in his address: "This is what I have done. In my business my workmen are partners with me. I give them every year a certain percentage of the profits of my business. They have had, in the last six years, over 112,000 francs out of the profits of my enterprise. This is what I have done. It is not what I promise to do but what I have done. This is feasible. This is practical. As far as LeBlanc and his theories of the organizations of labor are concerned, I have nothing to do with them."

Now, ladies and gentlemen, LeClaire had been going on in that way for some six years at that time, but his house has continued to flourish. It is now forty-seven years since his plan of dividing the profits between the employer and the employee was begun. It has vindicated itself in the most thorough way. It has commended itself,—that plan of his,—to over two hundred of the foremost practical business firms in Germany and France and Switzerland and England and America, and out of those two hundred firms one hundred and fifty are to-day practising this system of giving the employee a share in the profits of the business. They say that when the Paris mob, at the time of this uprising in Paris, went to the headquarters of the provisional government, Lamartine, who was then the head of the Directorate, ventured to address them; and he said, "What do you want?" And they cried out very plainly, "We want your head." "Well," said Lamartine, "if you had my head on all your shoulders, you would be a good deal wiser than you are now." If Lamartine himself had had LeClaire's head on his shoulders he never would have tried the plan of national workshops; he would have tried the plan of profit-sharing.

Now, ladies and gentlemen, I feel myself very much embarrassed, in speaking to an audience like this, as to how much I may enlarge on the subject of profit-sharing. I have tried very hard within the last two years to make myself a walking encyclopædia on the subject. I have embodied the results of those efforts in a voluminous volume indeed, but 400 pages of that book are simply facts—not my theories, not my opinions, but solid facts, to show what this system of assigning to the employee a share in the profits of business has done, and, just as frankly, what it has failed to do, wherever it has been tried. The system is this;—it admits of a great many varieties; it is not a cast-iron scheme, but the principle is this: That in carrying on any productive industry the fair and proper thing is, first, to give the current wages to the workmen; then a salary, and it ought to be a high salary, to the manager; then a current rate of interest to capital. Then, after providing for the depreciation of the plant and all the expenses of business, you have left the net profits of the business. Now, the common way, ladies and gentlemen, of dividing these profits is just this: The manager takes them all, or else he lets the capitalist, if he is a third person, or the party in the business, share with him; but the employee is entirely left out of sight. He has his reward from day to day, but he has no prospect of any share in the profits of business whatever.

Now, I am not anxious at all, in any way, shape or manner, to stand up for the natural rights of a working man. Natural rights, Mr. President and ladies and gentlemen, are

a very difficult subject to deal with. They are a very hard matter to define and to put in any tangible shape. But I do say this: what the experience of the profit-sharing firms shows is, that, whatever natural rights may be, it is good common sense, it is good business policy, it pays, it is for the self-interest of the employer, it is for the self-interest of the employee, to adopt this plan of bringing the employee into a kind of industrial partnership, — because, ladies and gentlemen, when the employee, the workman, has placed before him this prospect of a share in the profits, what does he do? What does any man that has got human nature in him do? Why, of course he works better, he comes earlier, he stops later, he is more economical of the material used, he is more careful of the tools. The men superintend each other, and save a great deal, in such establishments.

Profit-sharing, a division of the profits between the employer, the employee and the capitalist, in addition to regular wages and salary, has been shown by experience to be the fairest and most satisfactory method of conducting industries, in very many branches, at home and abroad. This is not theory, ladies and gentlemen; it is not a product, however beautiful and ingenious, of a novelist's fancy; it is not the product of a Christian Socialist's thinking about the kingdom of God; it is the solid, undeniable, frozen fact of business experience. And I address myself here, and I address myself wherever I speak of profit-sharing, most of all to those people who seem to the Christian Socialists, my friends there, and to the followers of Henry George, to have no rights that mankind is bound to respect, — that despised and insignificant set of people known as the employers and the manufacturers of the world; the men who have made this civilization what it is; the men whom you never can leave out of account under any circumstances; the men without whom you cannot take one single step forward that amounts to a row of pins. [*Applause.*]

Now, I know, sir, by experience of my own, that among the employers of labor there is a large amount of the Philistine element; but they are the rulers of the situation at the present day, and while we linger with pleasure and admiration over Mr. Bellamy's pages, and while we heartily agree with the spirit that animates the Christian Socialists, it is always, to practical men, the first question, "What is the next step?" I find great fault with my friends, the Christian Socialists, because they have left my pet hobby out of the programme entirely. They do not even mention it in that "*Dawn*" which they see arising with such a roseate flush over Christian Socialism and a regenerated world. I ventured to tell them, very plainly, the other night, that, however admirable their programme might be, there was a gulf between it and the present, and that the next step was that very thing which they had left out, — profit-sharing. [*Applause.*]

I hope that no one within the sound of my voice will get the idea that I quarrel with the people who have the desire to regenerate and reform mankind; but I do believe that they are really hindering progress in some degree, because, as I say, the employers, the manufacturers, the great business men, are those who must be converted if you are to regenerate the industrial world, — and they will not be converted if you hold up before them an ideal which even a literary fellow like myself, and a clergyman with us to-day, regard as not only unreasonable but very undesirable. I should be very sorry to live in the year 2000, in that monotonous world where so much has been done to crush out individualism and trample down ambition; where there is so much machinery and so little personal magnetism.

Now, according to President Garfield, what did Emerson tell us? I think he knew human nature pretty well. He said that mankind is always just as lazy as it dares to be. And Mr. Bellamy has entirely left out that hard and disagreeable fact from his future commonwealth. He expects mankind to be just as active, and just as energetic, for the public good, as they are for their private interest. But it would not be so. They would not do one one-hundredth part of the work in the year 2000, under that state of things, that they do in this despised year 1889. [*Applause.*]

Again, I am not ashamed, though a clergyman, to say that self-interest is a very good thing, and that if you can get a man to be virtuous even from self-interest, it is well. So I appeal to the self-interest of the employer, and show him, opening for him page after page and chapter after chapter, with hard facts to offer to his Philistine mind, that under a system of profit-sharing he will make more profit than under the common system. It will be for the best interest of both parties, for the employer and the employee alike.

But I am taking too much time, ladies and gentlemen. I only wish to say further that this scheme, which has remained thus far very largely unknown because of the lack of convenient sources of information, has approved itself to the leading political economists, and to a great many students of social life who are associated with all the reform movements. I have before me a letter from Prof. J. E. Thorold Rogers, the political economist, one of the best friends of the laboring man, heartily approving the idea, while he thinks that in protective countries he has a better chance than in free-trade countries like England. Mr. Frederic Harrison, of whom you all know, has likewise written me within a few days, to the effect that he is convinced that the wages system forms the natural, honorable and convenient means of remunerating labor, — "though I need not say," he goes on, "how trivial and unnatural much in our wages system is; but in the commercial and social evolution of the wages system is to be found the true solution of the industrial problem."

Mr. Minot J. Savage has written me that he, too, believes that it is always the important thing to consider "the next step," and that he is just as much convinced that profit-sharing is the next step as he also believes that profit-sharing is not the whole kingdom of God. It is, certainly, the next step, — beyond which we are prepared to go on to further and further steps as they approve themselves. I would remind my friend who spoke of Christian Socialism, that every Christian Socialist of the year 1855, in England, who is now alive, — Thomas Hughes and George Jacob Holyoake and the rest, — are to-day the strongest friends of profit-sharing that can be found anywhere. Mr. Hughes has written me — perhaps I should better call him Tom Brown, and then you will know who he is — Tom Brown has written me to say that, after all their trials and all their experiments, profit-sharing is the one sound, sensible, efficacious remedy for the trials of the afflicted labor-world. I have a long letter from Heber Newton to the same effect; and he tells us that it is a very common thing for men to say that the wage-system is the slavery-system, — but it is no such thing. It may be made to make slaves, but it is not in itself a slave-system.

I will close, ladies and gentlemen, by simply trying to correct a false impression which some of you have doubtless got from the Boston newspapers within the last few days. I was very sorry to see the other day, in the *Boston Herald* — I shall speak right out in meeting, because I have many friends on the *Boston Herald* — that Mr. John Wanamaker, of Philadelphia, who is to-day the most prominent private employer in America, was very much dissatisfied with his system; and the impression produced by the article was that he was going to abandon it. But what does Mr. Wanamaker say, in his speech at Philadelphia? You will understand that I am in no wise endorsing the Post-

master General of the country when I speak of John Wanamaker the business man; but he says, speaking to us,— "I am not satisfied with the vast success of this plan, and if you will aid in finding a better I shall join my partners in appointing, out of the seven years' force, a commission of nine people who shall consider this whole subject and report the results of their deliberations. We do not intend to do any walking backwards, but we want to go forward with all the intelligence we can command, and already the road we have started on leads to a closer relationship between the employer and the employee." That is from a Philadelphia newspaper; and if you cannot depend upon the Philadelphia newspaper to tell you the truth, you can depend on one of Mr. John Wanamaker's partners, and he writes to me of his own accord to say this: that "Mr. Wanamaker and both of his partners, of whom I am one, are quite satisfied that our methods failed in accomplishing to any marked degree either of the objects that we started out to attain; but I am personally persuaded that the difficulty is not so much with the principles as with their applications." And then he went on to tell me what the system was; and I was so vain, when I wrote to him, as I made haste to do, as to tell him that I had already pointed out, three months before, that any such system was very defective, and that no one had hope, in this country or abroad, of any of the legitimate effects of profit-sharing from any such scheme, because he paid out all the bonus at once, and did not give the employees any share in the establishment, — that is, in the stock, — and that is what he says they are now going to do. They are going to pay out probably a third part of the bonus in cash, and give the rest in stock, so that the employees shall gradually become partners, in a real and solid sense, in the business.

Ladies and gentlemen, I will repeat in closing what LeClaire, who was a man of genius if ever there was one in the industrial world, said in his will: "I am the humble follower of him who taught us that we should do to others as we would have others do to us, and that we should love our neighbors as ourselves." In this sense I desire to remain a Christian to my last breath. That is the kind of Christian Socialism that is going to regenerate the world; for, as Bishop Fraser, than whom a nobler man never wore the bishop's robe in England, declared to the co-operators some years ago, the object or task of this generation is not so much "to Christianize Socialism as to Socialize Christianity." Christianity, in the broad and fundamental sense of the word, is a socialist religion, founded on the socialistic principles of the brotherhood of man; and it is because we cannot get the evangelical Christianity of to-day all at once up to the Christian level, that I point to our plan of profit-sharing as simply one step, however short, however slow it may be, — one step, and the next step, for all who desire to see the kingdom of heaven made a little more of a reality upon this earth. [*Applause.*]

Before introducing the closing speaker of the afternoon the Chairman made the following announcement:

It is moved that the greetings of the Free Religious Association at this afternoon session of our Convention be sent to the President of the Association, the Rev. W. J. Potter, who was prevented from being with us by illness and who has, in spite of his request to the contrary, been elected President for the ensuing year.

The motion was seconded and carried unanimously, by a yea and nay vote, after which the Chairman introduced the last speaker to address the Convention, in the following words:

Each previous speaker has presented freely and forcibly, his own point of view in Social Reform. There should be some one, finally, to sum up these opinions. I have now the pleasure of introducing a gentleman of whom after a long acquaintance I am able to say that, to the best of my knowledge and belief, he has not a "hobby" about him. He has a head and a heart, and with the aid of those he will address us, and I hope he will find it convenient to sum up from his own clear point of view some of the different thoughts which have been presented here this afternoon. I now present to you the Reverend Frederick A. Hinckley, formerly of Providence, now of Northampton.

ADDRESS OF REV. F. A. HINCKLEY.

Mr. Chairman, Ladies and Gentlemen:

THERE is an old saying, "Scratch a Russian and you will catch a Tartar." I want to scratch some of these Russians here a little, or scratch some of these things they have been trying to represent, and see, if I can, what common ground, what common principles lie at the very heart of these various propositions which have been brought here before us this afternoon.

Now, these various movements, Nationalism, Socialism, Christian Socialism, Communism, Profit-sharing, — and we might enlarge the list, — derive, in my judgment, their vitality not from the fact that either of them covers the whole ground or represents a complete and spherical view of the case, but from the fact that they are inspired by a great spirit of humanity which, as it did not begin with them, fortunately will not end with them, — which began as far back as we can go in human history, and which, wherever we look, testifies, as it seems to me, to two things: First, to a great, common, active, growing conviction, and second, to a great, common and ever-enlarging dream. The conviction has been and is that somehow in this world the masses of mankind have never received and are not receiving what belongs to them by right [*applause*]; that somehow, under the political systems of the world, and under the industrial systems, the many have been ground up for the benefit of the few.

We see that, plainly, in the first place, in the political realm. Following me, if you will for a moment, in imagination, back to the times of primitive man, we find what? Why, the moment two men, or more than two men, meet, — in other words, the moment the necessity for society begins, or the fact of society begins, — there comes in a conflict of interests; and the strong man, the man who has the most muscle, takes advantage of the weak man. And that process goes on through untold years, until politically it culminates in the king; and then, having culminated in the king, the ameliorating process begins. Men protest against one-man power; they throw off the monarchy. Then we have aristocracy. Going on still further, — I cannot go into it in detail, for lack of time; but just hinting at the thought, going on still further, we come at last to a time when they fight aristocracy. Thus they come to have what we have in America, — a Republic, and, politically speaking, so far as we can see to-day, the ideal end of the process: a government of the people, for the people, by the people, a government of consent, a government in which the sovereignty rests upon the shoulders and in the hearts of all the people. That is the ideal end, politically speaking, so far as we can see to-day.

Well, now, as it seems to me, side by side with that growth politically, has gone a similar evolution of things industrially. In the first instance the strong man, taking advantage of the weak, would compel him to work for him; would take his life if he chose, — did take his life. Under what we call barbarism, the lowest forms of human industrial organization and social organization that we know anything about, that is the case. Well, then, later on, as a higher product of the process, came the chattel slave system. So far had we come; and when the one end was to overthrow this system, we were apt to think of that as the sum of all vileness, as in a certain sense it was. Often,

however, we have forgotten to think of it as a step in advance of that which was before it. From barbarism to chattel slavery was a step forward. Now, again, we take another advance. The next great step, industrially speaking, was, as it seems to me, from chattel slavery to the wages system. And barbarism, chattel slavery, and the wages system, are but three phases of industrial work and organization in the great work of evolution, every one of them the representative of and inspired by the competitive idea. However you look, however you analyze them, that is the great idea which inspired them, — the competitive idea. The atmosphere, industrially speaking, in which they all began, is looking out for number one. Every man is crowding every other man, to get ahead, and to rake into his net all that he can possibly get, regardless of the rights of other people. It is the "look out for number one" principle which the competitive idea represents, — appearing first in barbarism, second in chattel slavery, and third in the wages system.

Now, it has been said here to-day, by our friend who represented profit-sharing, if I do him justice, that there is no difficulty with the wages system in itself, the difficulty is with the application of the wages system. But I submit that the one great difficuity, in general terms, underlying all this suppression and oppression of the masses of mankind, in socialistic and industrial life, is seen in this very competitive idea of which to-day the wages system is the great representative. The conviction, deep down in the heart of the thoughtful and feeling people of this generation, growing stronger with every advancing day, is that the first duty of this hour is to study the condition of things under which we live, which results in so much poverty for the masses and so great accumulations of wealth in the hands of the few; and in pursuing that step, covering as best we may the entire ground, and looking at it from the point of view of the great theory of evolution, I believe that we shall come inevitably to the conclusion that it was the competitive idea which resulted in putting the one-man power at the top politically and industrially; that it was the competitive idea which resulted in chattel slavery in this country and elsewhere, and that it is the competitive idea which is at the heart of the wages system to-day.

Now, then, supposing that to be true, I want to place side by side with the views which here to-day have been presented, the other great fact to which it seems to me all these different systems point, — the great dream of humanity. The great dream of Nationalism, the great dream of Socialism and Christian Socialism, the great dream of all the different movements in behalf of a better industrial order, — that great dream has been what? Why, it has been for the coming of a time when the identity of human interests should be recognized; when it should be seen that the interests of each are identical with the interests of all [*applause*], and that the interests of all are identical with the interests of each.

Why, ladies and gentlemen, nearly twenty years it is, since it was my fortune to go to school, if I may so speak, in a little upper room on Bromfield street, in an organization which met there once a week, known as the Boston Eight Hour League, and to sit at the feet there of a man who, with a great deal of wisdom concerning the labor problem, had very little of the capacity for presenting it in such shape to the people whose attention he might command as to make it attractive to them, — a man who has now passed on to another world, Ira Stewart. It was my privilege to sit at his feet, and I have thought to-day how, in that little upper chamber twenty years ago, that man, whose name is probably unfamiliar to most of those who are now honoring me with their attention, proclaimed precisely the same great truths that have been proclaimed here to-day. I may say we have hardly heard a new thing to-day, — only the old thought clothed in new dress; only the old principles presented in a new order.

And, friends, I might go back more than twenty years for the origin of this great creed. I might go back eighteen hundred years, to Jesus himself in Palestine. You remember how he proclaimed, as the second great commandment, "Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself." That is the heart of Socialism, that is the heart of Nationalism, it is the heart of all this great reaching out for a better industrial order, of this great dream which sooner or later we hope to see realized.

Indeed, I might go back five hundred years before that time, and remind you that this dream was the dream of the great Indian Saint, who said, "My doctrine makes no distinction between rich and poor; it is like water, which washes and purifies all alike; it is like the sky, for it has room for all." I might go also to China, and remind you of Confucius uttering the same thought, cherishing the same great dream of benevolence and love to all men: "What you do not wish done to yourselves, do not unto others." It is the dream of the ages! It has come forward with the life of every great religious liberty. It has lived and inspired the thought and feeling of every great socialistic liberty. It spoke in the Brook-Farm movement in this State. It has spoken in all the Socialistic movements and the Communistic movements. It is speaking now in this Nationalistic movement.

Well, now, ladies and gentlemen, Socialism has not brought us to the millenium, has not enabled us to realize the dream. Nationalism will not enable us to realize that dream. It will help us, as Socialism has helped us. Profit-sharing will not enable us to realize the dream, but I believe that it will be, as has been claimed for it, a great step towards that greater end, which shall be the industrial co-operation of the golden cycle.

Something was said about mankind being lazy. With all reverence for any great man who ever said it, I dissent from it. [*Applause.*] I do not believe man is naturally a lazy animal. [*Applause.*] I believe most men and most women are doing too much work to-day. [*Applause.*] I believe that what men and women want, more than work, to-day, is more time for meditation [*applause*]; more time for revery; more time to stop and think about the character of this great universe in which we live, and the duties of this great universe, and the majesty of the power beneath and above and around this great universe in which we live. [*Applause.*] Talk to me about men being lazy! Take off some of this tremendous pressure of overwork; take off these harsh, cruel conditions which hold men and women down, give them a chance to show what they will do when opportunities offer; and I have faith to believe that it will always prove true that opportunities given are opportunities improved. [*Applause.*] So I want, if I can, to get a broad-range view, as our Chairman suggested. I want to see, if I can, and I think I do see, in every one of these movements which from time to time come forward, a very great step forward toward the realization of our dream. I think I see that. I welcome them on that account. So far as that is true of them I always feel like saying, "I am a Socialist, I am a Christian Socialist, I am a Communist, I am a Nationalist, I am anything that shall stand for a realization of that great dream." [*Applause.*] But, side by side with that, I want always to think and to say that when any one of these things claims to be the great All, if it shall so claim, it makes a mistake. It claims too much; and because I am so anxious that the conviction of the wrongfulness of the present condition of things should be extended broadly and deeply, and because I am so anxious that the great dream of co-operation, in that large sense of

the realization industrially of the golden rule, shall be recognized, I always want to guard myself against shutting myself up in any movement which is too narrow to cover all the ground. [*Applause.*]

I do not know, Mr. Chairman, — I wish I did, — I do not think anybody knows, — I wish somebody did, — how finally this great problem, the most intricate, the most far-reaching thing that has been given to man to solve, is to be solved. But I do believe this: that the solution will be hastened just in proportion as the earnest men and women, such men and women as I see before me, give to it the best they have to give of their thought and of their feeling. Just in proportion as they are willing to think about it and speak freely what they think, and to feel sympathetically toward those who are struggling to get, not their share, but to get even a little standing-room, in this world over which now competition rules, just in proportion as they shall think thus and feel thus will they help on the final solution.

For one, the dream is none too high for me. I want to be practical, I want to stand on the earth in this matter, I want to be ready to take very short steps at all times, but I want to reach away up to the realization of that dream of Jesus eighteen hundred years ago. I am Christian enough to be satisfied with that dream of his in this matter, — the universal Brotherhood of Man. That is the dream, the universal Brotherhood of Man practically applied. That is what we all are aiming for; that is what all these movements are aiming for. Just in proportion as we hold it up before us, just in that proportion shall we be inspired by it, and just in that proportion shall we move on towards it, until by-and-bye we shall have a system approximating so far forward towards it, that we shall almost think and feel — deeper than thinking it will be — that emulous heaven will yearn down, in its effort to reach the earth, as the earth, in our passion, shall have done her best to reach the sky. The divine there and the divine here will join hands. The divine here will respond to the divine everywhere.

Why, ladies and gentlemen, I know not what you may think, it may seem dreamy to talk about it, but to my mind that ideal is the motive power, the greatest power of all conceivable things, to move us up and on, and to make life worth living for us. Let us cherish the ideal, let us indulge in the dream, and just in proportion as we have opportunity in any of these movements, or in all of them combined, or in something better than any or all of them, let us see that our thought is focused on this mighty problem, and that our hearts beat responsive to those who are trying to solve it, and to those who, most of all, feel the need of solving it.

Sometimes we hear it said that there is great danger from infidelity. Well, there is one kind of infidelity which I fear; the infidelity which, having declared that the place to find the Kingdom of Heaven is here on earth, and that if we cannot find it here we cannot find it anywhere, — in which opinion I fully concur, — has yet no faith in the possibilities of justice, in the possibilities of knowledge, here and now! [*Applause.*]

For one, wherever a heart beats in response to the summons to do what can be done to make a little heaven right here upon the earth, to introduce, not God in the constitution, but God into the daily life of mankind [*applause*]; wherever that summons comes, I want to be found hand in hand with the little company, marching shoulder to shoulder with them, and sharing with them whatever of struggle, whatever of defeat, whatever of victory may attend. [*Applause.*]

THE CHAIRMAN: — With this simple and manly benediction I will declare the Convention adjourned.

THE FESTIVAL.

IMMEDIATELY after the Afternoon Session of the Convention, the friends and members of the Association began to gather in large numbers in the Meionaon Hall of the Temple, to enjoy the Annual Festival and Supper, — where, amidst the delightful strains of music furnished by Baldwin's Cadet Orchestra, old acquaintances were renewed and new ones made.

At 8 o'clock, D. G. Crandon, Chairman of the Festival Committee, called to order by remarking that the Free Religious Festival, besides providing a feast to the material man, also served an additional banquet for the sustenance and development of that spiritually free man for which the Free Religious Association was continually striving. He said that the Committee deemed themselves especially fortunate in having been able to secure a "savage" to preside; and while that might seem, on the face of it, strange and paradoxical, he needed but to add that the Savage he should presently introduce was really no savage at all, but one of the most gentle and kindly of men, and so acknowledged and accepted by all, save perhaps by a few of our evangelical Christian friends, whose creeds he has done so much, and is still doing so much, to undermine, broaden, or exterminate. By some delightful inconsistency, this *gentle*-man — who has written and said so much that is grand, both in prose and poetry — still bears the cognomen, *Savage*. However, just as we shall continue to enjoy Shakspere even if it shall be demonstrated that it is not Shakspere, but Bacon, so we shall, I think, always enjoy the words of wisdom and cheer that fall from the lips of this nineteenth century Savage. (Rev. M. J. Savage was thereupon introduced as the presiding officer of the evening.)

Mr. Savage was received with a most cordial and hearty outburst of applause, and after referring to the numerous and arduous calls made upon many during Anniversary week, yet expressing the pleasure it gave him to be present on this occasion, he introduced, in his usual happy manner, as the first speaker of the evening, Mr. Edwin D. Mead, the Secretary of the Association.

ADDRESS OF MR. EDWIN D. MEAD.

I REMEMBER that it has been customary to make these evening festivals a continuation in some sort of the more serious exercises of the day; and I am glad to add a word upon the subject which we have all been thinking about. I hesitated for a moment as to which of the two subjects of the day I should give the hurried and somewhat desultory remarks which, I fear, are all I have to give. But I reflect that these two questions, the question of the Public Schools and the question raised by "Looking Backward," are really both parts of one great question, the question of the proper tasks and functions of the State.

The Public School is really the brightest illustration and result of Socialism — Socialism working in the highest realm. We see that it is good for the State, that it is necessary for the safety of this Republic, that there should be this public education, and so we have it, whatever the theories of some about private schools and the good of competition and the rights of men who send no children to the schools. Aristotle saw the necessity of this public education to a free State two thousand years ago, just as he saw that the object of the State altogether is the supreme good of man, and that the supreme good is not the good of the body but the good of the soul. The State to him was no mere commissariat, and also no machine charged merely with the functions of taxation and police. Its object, he said, was not simply to help men to live, but to help them to live well. I do not think the less of this because Aristotle said it. I do not think the less of any doctrine because it is old and has kept appearing and reappearing in the centuries. Socialism is disparaged now as a reversion, as going back to something talked about and experimented

with and left behind in a distant past. Never be afraid of going backward for wisdom, if wisdom lies there. I confess to having more hope of the man who is reading Aristotle and Plato than of the man who is reading Herbert Spencer and George Henry Lewes. We go back for much philosophy, much art, much religion, much of almost everything better than the things of this month or last. Almost every great movement in history, almost every advance, has been to a certain extent a renaissance. Civilization, as has been often remarked, moves in spirals, and we keep returning close to old positions, enriched by intervening experience. The despots of the feudal times might have disparaged Greek democracy as an outgrown standpoint, but we have advanced back to it. We are coming to a higher conception and definition of the State. Our State, our democratic State, has been too much a policed atomism. We are coming to see that the State is not concerned simply with keeping people's hands off each other while all separately do their work as they will; it is concerned with the highest welfare and development of all its citizens. We are coming to see that simply as citizens we are as truly our brothers' keepers as we used to feel ourselves as churchmen.

Boston "Nationalism" is one form of the demand making itself everywhere felt for a higher public spirit and more religious politics. It has my sympathy. It lays the stress in the right place, the public, unselfish place. I have thought that the movement was perhaps having a little too quick and popular growth to be quite healthy and strong. Ten years ago "socialism" and "socialist" were unfashionable and dangerous words here. To-day the greatest danger is that socialism may become a little too fashionable, a little too suddenly fashionable, may, in a word, become a "fad" with us. I had to tell a friend in Chicago the other day—in Chicago socialism is very unfashionable—that it was more fashionable here in Boston this year than even Esoteric Buddhism; and I wrote yesterday to a socialist friend in England, who wants to come here to lecture, but fears he should find himself detested and starved, that that was the last thing which need concern him, for he would find his brethren here chiefly in soft raiment and in kings' houses. But all this is trifling. Anything extravagant or sentimental or unhealthy in this movement will, I trust, correct itself. I do not remember that Jay Gould, and the sundry shining lights of Wall Street and the Chicago wheat-trade, exponents of the competitive system, are indefectible or without vagaries.

Let this movement be measured by its fundamental purpose. Its great meaning is good. It is awakening the sense of duty and of brotherhood in a way which will not let it easily go to sleep again. The socialistic principle needs far greater application here to-day. It is not, properly understood, antagonistic to that principle of individualism, of freedom and self-reliance, in which we here in New England have firmly believed, which Emerson taught us so powerfully, and for which this Association especially has stood and will continue to stand. It is the complement of that principle. In industrial and economic affairs, as in other affairs, I do not believe that either socialism or individualism is a principle of exclusive or universal validity. I believe that the things which the State as such should do and will do forever vary and are always to be determined by the sagacious practical statesmanship of the time. But I do believe that in our State to-day, and for long, we need to work immensely in the socialistic direction, to make a balance. I should be very glad to see our railroads taken by the State. I believe that they will be; I believe it is inevitable. We shall follow the same course here that we have followed in the case of turnpikes and toll-bridges. We shall soon see that it is not sensible nor right to leave these things to be run by private parties for their own good, but that the State should do it for the public good. We shall see, I say, that it is not right, and we shall see that it is not good politics. Men talk of the danger of greater corruption in our civil service, with the railroads under State control. The greatest danger in American politics to-day comes from these railroads under their present control. No danger to the civil service which I can possibly foresee is half so great as the corrupt influence of the great corporations to-day in the lobbies of our legislatures.

When we speak of the State in a republic, let us remember—let us never forget—that the State is simply ourselves administering our own affairs; not, as in old time, something outside and above, acting for us. There may be socialisms which are "paternal"; socialism in a democracy is fraternal. We hear people talk of the "slavery" of having tasks and hours determined by the State. I fail to see it. I do not see how the letter-carrier is any more a "slave" than the spinner. The question of slavery is not a question of who sets the tasks, but of who sets the best times and the best tasks. I do not condemn the competitive system. It has had its place. It has done much for us. It is now itself teaching us how wasteful and unwise it counts itself in much, by running up into great combinations in carrying itself out. Let us learn the lesson of these Syndicates and "Trusts." I am willing to learn lessons of the devil when the devil has any lessons to teach—and I think he has a good many. Somebody has said that the devil is simply misdirected God—the same intellect applied to selfish ends instead of unselfish and universal ends. And the children of this world, we have high authority for saying, are often much wiser in their generation than the children of light. I read a letter in the newspaper the other day, arguing that the great devil of this time is the spirit of monopoly. The writer was more personal than that. The greatest of monopolies, he said, is the Standard Oil Company; the brains of the Standard Oil Company is John D. Rockafellar; and therefore, for the purposes of his argument, he treated John D. Rockafellar as the devil. In making use of his illustration, I hope I shall not offend our good Baptist brethren, to whom Mr. Rockafellar has just given $600,000 for a college. I assure them I am speaking entirely in a Pickwickian sense.

My point is simply this: If selfishness, "the devil," the mere spirit of money-making, acting with most intelligent shrewdness, has come to see that indiscriminate "free competition" is not the good thing, but that combination, the Trust, is better, why should not unselfishness, public spirit, the State, in some way learn the lesson? Is it not possible that we are going through much the same process industrially that the Middle Ages went through politically, when the people rallied powerfully round the kings, to overcome the tyranny of the feudal lords? This overshadowing, greater power of the king, we know, meant greater liberty for the people. May it not be something so in the conflict between the great monopolies, Syndicates or Trusts, and that greater Trust into which the whole people may resolve itself? I do not know that, when the State does learn its lesson well, it will assume or "establish" everything, leave nothing to individual initiative or enterprise. I imagine there are many virtues and uses in voluntaryism which a universal establishment might endanger. But I am unwilling to draw any fast lines and say that this is proper for the State to undertake and that is not; to allow, as has lately been urged at the State House, that it is legitimate and proper for a city to manage its own water supply, but not its electric lights. And whatever practical objections may be urged against the application of the socialistic principle in this case or that, I am glad of this opportunity to express my dissent from the many current theoretical objections to the socialistic principle in the State. They seem

to me to be generally based on a poor and inadequate definition of the State, and to imply a view of society and of human nature which is not complimentary or encouraging and does not make for progress.

We may profitably learn something from the logic of events in this matter, from the logic of facts. Mr. Hale's recent address on "Our Wealth in Common" shows us to what extent we have all become Socialists in spite of ourselves. The proceedings in the improvement of cities, in the wholesale construction of healthy tenement-houses, and the rest, in England, notably in Birmingham and Glascow, as we have lately been learning from Mr. Cuckson and Mr. Shaw, show us to what common sense is bringing Englishmen, whatever general notions about Socialism or individualism may be fashionable; and Englihmen are said to be a specially hard-headed lot of men, not bookish and theoretical like the Germans. It is in municipal administration, which we are now realizing to be so important, — here much more than in national affairs, — that we are seeing the application of the socialistic principle.

I welcome the "Christian Socialism" of which we have heard to-day. I welcome whatever indicates more humanity in the churches and among religious men. It is refreshing to hear a man like Bishop Huntington declaring, as he has recently done, "It is not scientific doubt, not atheism, not pantheism, not agnosticism, that in our day and in this generation is likely to quench the light of the Gospel; it is a proud, sensuous, selfish, church-going, hollow-hearted prosperity." Utterances like these, and they are multiplying fast, show that churchmen are waking to a truer sense of their responsibility and function in the world. To-day it is not in the churches that Christianity itself finds its best representation and does its best work. The world is, on the whole, I think, better to-day than the church. The clergyman, addressing the world, assumes at once a manlier tone, feeling himself measured by higher and severer standards; the great secular newspaper discusses even religious questions in a broader, fairer and more religious way than the religious newspaper. We are advancing, in a word, from the dispensation of the church to the dispensation of the Commonwealth. The birth of a higher view of the State and its duties is happily coincident with the decay of the old theology. What has made the young men who are troubled with the old theology — I talk with more of them, perhaps, than some of you do — slow and reluctant to break with the old churches has not been any special need or affection for miracles at Cana of Galilee or elsewhere. They have shrunk from leaving the old church and from seeming to antagonize it, because they had, or thought they had, in the church, a better social ideal than was offered them or offered the world elsewhere. Their hesitation was right. A social ideal man must have. We must somehow, in the church or out of it, live and work for the kingdom of God. I believe that a satisfying and truly religious social ideal is being formed for us in that higher conception of the State which, however the details of the industrial organization may finally be settled, is gradually taking shape as the old church decays.

Following Mr. Mead, Mrs. Abby Morton Diaz was introduced.

Mrs. Diaz spoke in favor of Nationalism. She was conscious of being with the minority, but she had often been with minorities, yet always on the winning side. The present object of the Nationalists was to put in operation the forces which would make Nationalism the natural thing. Applied Christianity is the truest political economy. People think they cannot apply the Christianity which is preached to them because they are so selfish. What we wish to do is to raise them to a higher level. Another reason why I say this Christianity should be applied to civilization is to put an end to the present absurd situation. There are many people who are preaching this brotherhood of the race, and thousands of dollars are spent to have it preached, and yet they say it cannot be practised! What is the use of keeping up such a farce? Let us either renounce Christianity altogether, or else apply it. On Sunday you hear people preaching, "Seek another's, not your own good." But on Monday you see them working entirely for their own good. How can we lift these forces of humanity up? They say you cannot, because people will always be selfish. If that be true, it is giving up the universe to the power of evil. One objection raised against Nationalism is, "But have we got to love everybody, and do for everybody, and give everything away?" Those who raise that objection seem to forget that if everybody were giving something, everybody would also be receiving something. I want to say a few words, too, in answer to the objection that is made, that this unselfishness will destroy competition, and that everything will be lifeless. Here again it is assumed that the highest efforts must be for selfish ends; that competition must always be competition for selfish gain. Cannot you imagine a state of things where all would try to do the best that is possible, for the sake of the best thing? — the artist, for instance, trying to make the best portrait for the sake of art, and the poet giving us his best productions for the good of all? So we should put everything on a higher plane and motive. Nationalism would produce the true individualism. The Nationalists did not think that all this was going to be done in a day. It was going to take a long time. But that was all the more a reason why we should begin now.

Mrs. Ednah D. Cheney said that she hardly agreed either with Mr. Mead or Mrs. Diaz, that there was not enough of association. She had felt the danger of too much association, and that there had come to be too little sense of personal or individual responsibility. The great need of the present time is this sense of individual responsibility. This is especially noticeable in the field of labor, where a workman had come to feel that he must be engaged not because he was a good workman but because he was a member of a society. She believed in combination and association, but she feared we were going too fast in that direction. In conclusion, Mrs. Cheney spoke a few words of gentle reproof to the Association in regard to its absence from places where it should have been, where its influence for truth, justice, liberality and breadth of thought would have counted for a great deal. There had been questions before the legislature, the past winter, with reference to which the Association might profitably have made itself the organ of liberal thought.

Other speakers followed, until, at a late hour, with a pleasant word looking forward, the Chairman declared the Festival over and the outlook of Work before every member.

Without question the Convention of 1889 was one of the most hopeful, enthusiastic, and practical, of recent years.

NOTES.

WHAT SHALL COME OF IT ALL?

It was fine to listen to; it was helpful, and inspiring. It was good to be there. But the question now is, What shall come of it all?

SHALL IT ALL END IN WORDS?

The time for free religion only is passing. The Free Religious Association sees this. The call To-day is not, any longer, "Free Religion," but a Freed Society. And now the thought and work of men like Higginson and Garrison and Mead and Savage shall be — for Man still, indeed, as always heretofore; but not for Man in his thought only, but for man in his life. It shall not all end in words.

MR. SAVAGE'S ADDRESS.

Mr. Savage fears that inasmuch as he was unable to correct the proof of his address, it may contain reporters'

errors for which he will not like to be held responsible. We think, however, that it all reads as if there was good brain and good sense behind it, and if the reporters made any of it up they ought to be given frequent opportunity to do something similar.

MR. MEAD'S OUTSPOKEN WORD.

It no longer requires bravery, perhaps, to speak the word of truth. Still, so artificial, so conventional, so lacking in candor, so largely puffed up with pride, is much of modern churchly society, that at least we may denominate this word from Mr. Mead, at the Free Religious Festival, as "refreshing": "To-day it is not in the churches," he said, "that Christianity itself finds its best representation and does its best work. The world is, on the whole, I think, better to-day than the church. The clergyman, addressing the world, assumes at once a manlier tone, feeling himself measured by higher and severer standards; the great secular newspaper discusses even religious questions in a broader, fairer and more religious way than the religious newspaper. We are advancing, in a word, from the dispensation of the church to the dispensation of the Commonwealth."

IN OUR NEXT ISSUE.

The unexpected call upon our space in this number of The New Ideal, to accommodate the Report of the Free Religious Convention, compels the deferring till the August issue of the two articles which were to be "concluded in July,"—"A Vision," by Elissa M. Moore, and "A Study of Religion and Science," by A. N. Adams. Their interest is such that they can afford to wait, being sure of a cordial welcome when they appear. The August paper will contain, also, Part V. of "The Philosophy of Free Religion," by Dr. F. E. Abbot; "The Christ that is to Be," by F. M. Holland; another paper in the practical ethical series by Dr. Edmund Montgomery; a fine essay, "Sentiment vs. Science," by Dr. C. T. Stockwell; "Winds of Snows," a poem, by Horace L. Traubel, and various other matters of value. We are promised, furthermore, articles shortly on pressing economic questions, by Laurence Gronlund, F. M. Holland, and other competent "theorizers" and "experimenters."

"THE MODERN SCIENCE ESSAYIST."

From the press all over the country come words of appreciation as to the value and low price of *The Modern Science Essayist* series of Evolution lectures. Eight numbers are now ready, as noted in the advertisement on the last cover-page of this paper. No. 7, "The Descent of Man," by Prof. E. D. Cope, Editor of *The American Naturalist*, and No. 8, "Evolution of the Mind," by Dr. Robert G. Eccles, are the numbers issued since we last noted in these columns the progress of the series.

"TRINITY CHURCH EXEMPTION."

In the June New Ideal we quoted from certain papers sentences condemnatory of the exemption from taxation of the immense property of Trinity Church, New York. In our next issue we shall have space to present, in justice to Trinity, certain facts of a nearer correct nature.

CORRESPONDENCE.

THE ECONOMIC QUESTION.

Editor of The New Ideal:—

I was glad to find the economic question introduced in the May number of The New Ideal. To my mind, a paper that ignores the momentous subject of the distribution of wealth cannot be truly religious, because religion and reform are to me inseparable ideas—as they should be to every secularist.

And economic reforms appear the most necessary, inasmuch as I look upon the existing gross extremes of wealth and poverty as chiefly responsible for political corruption, vice, idleness, and many other human ills. I know some who would answer to this, "Teach men the Golden Rule, and all other reforms will follow." But I will give you the outlines of a cartoon, and your mental vision can fill them in: Picture an arrogant, herculean figure to represent society; that is, the successful part of it. Next, a starved, weak, and vicious-looking object, to represent the troublesome, unsuccessful part of it. Let the second figure be prostrate beneath the first, who is crushing the life out of it with both feet. The first is holding in his hand a lash, but his mouth is full of Golden Rule. You can now perhaps see the situation as I do.

I am glad, then, that Mr. Holland has elected to give us some ideas on an economic subject. I do not concur, however, with his method of treating it. As a writer on liberty of conscience, on ethics, education, etc., Mr. Holland has held my admiration for many years. To this matter of adjusting taxation, however, he does not seem to bring his customary philosophic breadth of view. It does not appear that he has adopted for his guidance any other basic principle than a *desire* to do justice. His remedies rather savor of the empirical—varying and unconnected. My own belief is that if society is natural, its regulation must be natural also. If government is natural, then the laws by which society is governed must be natural laws, and there must consequently be a natural law for the collection of taxes. Mr. Holland sees that there is a difficulty in collecting taxes on stocks, bonds, personal property, etc. Naturally there is. These values in most instances are the creation of individual labor, and should go entirely for the defraying of individual expenses. Land values, on the contrary, are the creation of society in the aggregate, as is proven from the fact that in new and sparsely-settled regions land values scarcely exist, but increase as population increases; from which it follows that the community as a *whole*, and *not* the individual, is the creator of land values or rent. A value thus created by society in general can be most justly and appropriately appropriated to defray society's general expenses.

Of course this is straight Single Tax doctrine, but Mr. Holland fears that to reduce all taxes to a land tax would bear too heavily on farmers and mechanics. As a farmer and mechanic myself, I thank him. However, after eight years of reflection, I have concluded that I would prefer to be taxed naturally and scientifically. I want what's right, though the heavens fall, and I am not afraid of the result for myself or for any man. Neither am I afraid that I should have to pay more taxes. To explain why, as a farmer, my taxes would be no greater under the Single Tax system would render a full exposition of the system necessary. This can best be found between the covers of "Progress and Poverty," or by communicating with a Single-Tax Club. I shall be happy if my remarks should induce a single reader of The New Ideal to cast aside hearsay and the babble of its detractors, and study this great subject for himself. This plan has convinced many opponents.

F. Harmer.

[We gladly print the above letter, and if the writer will refer to past numbers of The New Ideal he will see that this paper has given frequent unmistakable hints that it is working on social lines—that it recognizes well the truth that religion to-day means social regeneration or it means nothing. Moreover, the columns of The New Ideal are and always will be open to any one who has a word worthy of hearing on economic questions. We do not hold it likely that many of our readers, who have worked their way out of the darkness of one infallible book, will leap to the sudden acceptance of another book as infallible—not all at once, nor even if the book be "Progress and Poverty"; but we think they will candidly and eagerly accept all of good, and of reason, that Henry George or any other man can offer, and work heartily with him and all other earnest souls in the lines that seem most just.]

BOOKS OF MODERN THOUGHT.

Sent postpaid to any address, on receipt of price, by The New Ideal Company.

LESSONS FROM THE WORLD OF MATTER AND THE WORLD OF MAN. By Theodore Parker. $1.25.

Selected from notes of unpublished sermons, by Rufus Leighton. A large volume of striking passages from Parker, varying in length from a fraction of a page to five or six pages. Pronounced by a sympathetic critic to be, on the whole, the best volume of Parker for readers unfamiliar with his writings. A few of the topics: Man to make his own Paradise; The False Idea of Man a hindrance to his progress; Man's Progress not by miracle, but by the use of Natural Forces; Power of the Human Will over Circumstances; the Necessity for an Ideal; Death a Blessing to Man, etc., etc. 430 pages.

DISCOURSE ON MATTERS PERTAINING TO RELIGION. By Theodore Parker. Cloth, $1.50. Paper, $1.00.

New edition, with Introduction by O. B. Frothingham, and Biographical sketch by Hannah Stevenson. Treats of Natural Religion, the Bible, Jesus, Immortality, etc., etc. "A strong book, marking an era in American thought—written with a fore-feeling of evolution and the comparative method. A helping power for many."—*The Enquirer.*

LIFE OF THEODORE PARKER. By O. B. Frothingham. $2.00.

"The best of the three or four lives extant."

MAN, WOMAN AND CHILD. By M. J. Savage. 200 pages, $1.00.

A book on marriage, divorce, the home, the education of sons and daughters, the rights of women, the duties and opportunities of all. "No one can read it without breadth of view, without a growing sympathy and tenderness, without resolves to be a better man or woman, worthier to love and be loved."

THE DUTIES OF WOMEN. By Frances Power Cobbe. Cloth, $1.00. Paper, cheap edition, 25 cts.

"The profoundest, wisest, purest, noblest book in principle, aim and tone yet written upon the *true position of woman in society.*"

LOVE AND THEOLOGY. A religious and ethical novel. By Celia Parker Woolley. $1.50.

A brilliant Story by a talented writer whose name is not unfamiliar to liberal readers. "It is not only entertaining as a story, but engrosses interest from the highest ethical standpoint." "No book of fiction lately printed has had the depth and value of this; and nowhere has the present study and questioning of theological subjects been more clearly and satisfactorily presented."

SCIENCE AND IMMORTALITY. Cloth, 75 cents; Paper, 50 cents.

A "Symposium" giving the opinions of many of the most prominent scientific men in this country concerning the relation of science to the question of immortality. Concise, candid, the earnest thought of the foremost thinkers of the day, whether of expectation or of doubt.

PRACTICAL PIETY. Four Sermons by J. Ll. Jones. 60 pages, 30 cents.

"Short, bright, readable, earnest, liberal, helpful," on topics touching human life at the foundation.

A YEAR OF MIRACLE. By Wm. C. Gannett. Cloth, limp, red edges, 50 cents. Beveled edges, full gilt, $1.00.

"A Poem in Four Sermons." "A dainty little book, full of delicate fragrance. Love of nature is in it, and a longing to interpret that secret of nature's power over the soul which no man has yet understood. There is devotion in it, too, and neither clashes with the other "—*Critic.*

THE BIBLE FOR LEARNERS. By Dr. H. Oort and Dr. I. Hooykaas, with the assistance of Dr. A. Kuenen. 3 vols. Each, $2.00.

Comprising the results of modern German research and criticism, it is the Bible story told in connected form, with a history of the book and of the Bible countries and peoples. Admirable and valuable. *Old Testament*, Vol. I., Patriarchs, Moses, Judges; Vol. II., Kings and Prophets. *New Testament*, Vol. III.

"THE NEW UNCLE TOM'S CABIN."

Edward Bellamy's

Looking Backward

In Cloth, $1.50. Paper, 50 Cts.

"Bellamy's wonderful book."—EDWARD EVERETT HALE.

"*It has made a deeper and more lasting impression than any other book of the year, not even excepting the two great theological novels.*"—Boston Herald.

"The vital, inspiring, hopeful, convincing power of this book."—*Literary World.*

"The extraordinary effect which Mr. Bellamy's romance has had with the public; * * * one cannot deny the charms of the author's art; * * * this alluring allegory."—W. D. HOWELLS.

"Immensely attractive."—*Commercial Bulletin.*

"That astonishing book, 'Looking Backward'; how it haunts one like a grown-up 'Alice in Wonderland.' The mind follows entranced."—*Boston Gazette.*

"That remarkable and fascinating novel which so many are now reading."—E. C. STEDMAN, in *The Critic.*

"A very extraordinary work."—*Historical American.*

"A romance of surpassing merit and noble purpose."—EDGAR FAWCETT.

"It is a revelation and an evangel."—FRANCES E. WILLARD.

"The book which thoughtful and serious-minded people are chiefly reading and discussing."—*Boston Herald.*

"It is the 'Uncle Tom's Cabin' of the new era."—*The People.*

Bellamy's exceedingly clever book.—*New York Tribune.*

JESUS:

HIS OPINIONS and CHARACTER

The New Testament Studies of a Layman.

By GEORGE F. TALBOT.

"Much time and profound study have been needed for this thoughtful work. Whoever the layman may be, he is accustomed to dealing with evidence, which he treats in a lawyer-like fashion, and in a peculiarly direct and simple style. While his conclusions will be classed by many as rationalistic, in that they make Jesus simply a great moral teacher, and set aside as fabulous much of the Scripture on which Theological dogmas have been based, the tone of the volume is still reverent and high. The writer is one of that great sect of 'seekers' the nineteenth century furnishes,—eager for truth, and accepting its highest teachings everywhere. He deserves respect as an honest and earnest thinker."—*The Continent, Philadelphia.*

—PRICE, $1.50.—

THE FAITH OF REASON. By J. W. Chadwick. $1.00.

A series of Discourses on the Leading Topics of Religion: The Nature of Religion, God, Immortality, Prayer, Morals. "Free, original, brave, manly speech is here."

BELIEF IN GOD. By M. J. Savage. 176 pages, $1.00.

An Examination of some Fundamental Theistic Problems. Some of the Chapters: Origin and Development of the Idea of God, Does God Exist? Is God Conscious, Personal and Good? Shall we Worship God?

CREED AND DEED. By Felix Adler. $1.00.

Essays from the standpoint of Ethical Culture: on Immortality, Religion, The New Ideal, Spinoza, The Founder of Christianity, Reformed Judaism, and others.

THE FAITH THAT MAKES FAITHFUL. Eight Life-Sermons, by Wm. C. Gannett and J. Ll. Jones. Pages, 131. In imitation Parchment, 50 cents; Cloth, full gilt, $1.00.

The topics: Blessed be Drudgery, I Had a Friend, A Cup of Cold Water, and Wrestling and Blessing, by Mr. Gannett; and Faithfulness, Tenderness, the Seamless Robe, and The Divine Benediction, by Mr. Jones. "All who try to make their religion a thing of the present, who try to find living remedies for living difficulties, will be greatly helped by this publication."—*Boston Transcript.*

THE MAN JESUS. By John W. Chadwick. $1.00.

Seven Lectures: Sources of Information; Place and Time; Birth, Youth and Training; Jesus as "Prophet;" Jesus as "Messiah;" The "Resurrection;" The "Deification." Rational, yet sympathetic.

JESUS: HIS OPINIONS AND CHARACTER. The New Testament Studies of a Layman. $1.50.

"Much time and profound study have been needed for this thoughtful work. Whoever the layman may be, he is one accustomed to dealing with evidence, which he treats in a lawyer-like fashion, and in a peculiarly direct and simple style. While his conclusions will be classed by many as rationalistic, the tone of the volume is still reverent and high."—*The Continent, Philadelphia.*

A STUDY OF PRIMITIVE CHRISTIANITY. By Lewis G. Janes. 319 pages. $1.50.

Treats of the natural evolution of the Christian Religion, according to the historical method, applying the assured results of modern criticism to the question of the historical verity of Jesus, the investigation of his life and teaching, and the development of organized Christianity.

CHRISTIAN HISTORY IN ITS THREE GREAT PERIODS. By Joseph Henry Allen. 3 vols., each, $1.25.

First Period, Early Christianity. Second Period, The Middle Ages. Third Period, Modern Phases. Gives the entire development of Catholic Christianity to the eve of the Reformation, with modern phases of Religious Life. Advanced, and full of helpful views.

THE BIBLE OF TO-DAY. By J. W. Chadwick. $1.00.

The Old Testament; The Prophets; The Histories; Moses and the Pentateuch; The Law; The Psalms and Other Writings; The Apochrypha; The New Testament; Paul's Epistles; The Catholic Epistles; Revelation; Acts; The Four Gospels. "The need of some such work is keenly felt by thousands of intelligent persons who are not in a position to make an adequate study of the elaborate works in which this criticism has written its comments, yet earnestly desire to know what conclusions the various scholars who have made studies of the subject have reached."—*N. Y. Evening Post.* "The best piece of work in this direction America has produced."—*Boston Sunday Herald.*

THE RELIGION OF ISRAEL. By J. Knappert. An abstract of the great work of Prof. Kuenen. $1.00.

"Here we have, for $1.00, just what many are praying for,—a book which gives in a compact form the conclusions of the 'advanced scholarship' concerning the Old Testament record."—*Register.*

RADICAL PROBLEMS. By C. A. Bartol. $1.25.

"A protest against popular theology; and 'radical,' not in the sense of overturning, but in its true sense, that of attempting to pierce to the roots of things."

The Morals of Evolution. By M. J. SAVAGE. 191 pages, $1.00.

Treats such topics as The Origin of Goodness, The Nature of Goodness, The Sense of Obligation, The Relativity of Duty, Morality and Religion in the Future, etc., etc. "We all owe Mr. Savage thanks for the earnestness, frankness, and ability with which he has here illustrated the modern scientific methods of dealing with history, philosophy, and morality." "The book is a fund of intellectual and moral cheer."

The Evolution of Immortality. Suggestions of an Individual Immortality, based upon our Organic and Life History. By C. T. STOCKWELL. Cloth, 12mo, gilt top, 69 pages, $1.00.

One of the most suggestive and best developed essays on personal immortality which later years have produced.—*Literary World.*

Evolution: A Summary of Evidence. By Capt. ROBT. C. ADAMS. Pamphlet, 44 pages, 25 cents.

"An admirable presentation and summing up of the Evolution Argument."

Freedom and Fellowship in Religion. Introduction, "The Religious Outlook," by O. B. FROTHINGHAM. Cloth, 424 pages, $1.50.

Partial Contents: The nature of Religion, by David A. Wasson; Freedom in Religion, by Samuel Johnson; Religion and Science, by John Weiss; Christianity and its Definitions, by Wm. J. Potter; The Genius of Christianity and Free Religion, by F. E. Abbot; The Soul of Protestantism, by O. B. Frothingham; Philanthropy, by T. W. Higginson; Religion as Social Force, by Ednah D. Cheney; Sections also by Emerson, Alcott, Bartol, Wendell Phillips, Lucretia Mott, and others.

Handsomely printed, 24 to 32 pages each.

The Modern Science Essayist.

POPULAR EVOLUTION ESSAYS AND LECTURES.

Issued Monthly, or oftener. Subscriptions for the 15 Lectures below enumerated, $1.50.
Single Number, 10 cents.

These Numbers Now Ready:

1. *Herbert Spencer*. His life, writings, and philosophy. By Mr. Daniel Greenleaf Thompson.
2. *Charles Robert Darwin:* His life, works, and influence. By Rev. John W. Chadwick.
3. *Solar and Planetary Evolution:* How suns and worlds come into being. ***14 Illustrations.*** By Mr. Garrett P. Serviss.
4. *Evolution of the Earth:* The story of geology. By Dr. Lewis G. Janes.
5. *Evolution of Vegetal Life:* By Mr. William Potts.
6. *Evolution of Animal Life:* By Dr. Rossiter W. Raymond.
7. *The Descent of Man:* His origin, antiquity, growth. By Prof. E. D. Cope.
8. *Evolution of Mind:* Its nature and development. By Dr. Robert G. Eccles.

In Preparation:

9. *Evolution of Society:* Families, tribes, states, classes. By Mr. James A. Skilton.
10. *Evolution of Theology:* Development of religious beliefs. By Mr. Z. Sidney Sampson.
11. *Evolution of Morals:* Egoism, altruism, utilitarianism, etc. By Dr. Lewis G. Janes.
12. *Proofs of Evolution:* The eight main scientific arguments. By Mr. Nelson C. Parshall.
13. *Evolution as Related to Religious Thought:* By Rev. John W. Chadwick.
14. *The Philosophy of Evolution:* Its relation to prevailing systems. By Mr. Starr H. Nichols.
15. *The Effects of Evolution on the Coming Civilization.* By Rev. Minot J. Savage.

It is hoped that the publication of these lectures may aid societies and individuals throughout the country, in organizing and conducting classes in the study of Evolution, and thereby prepare many minds for an intelligent and systematic perusal of the more voluminous and scientific works of Darwin, Spencer, and other standard authorities.

[From HERBERT SPENCER.]

"The mode of presentation seems to me admirably adapted for popularizing Evolution views."

[From JOHN FISKE.]

"I think your schedule attractive and valuable."

THE NEW IDEAL COMPANY, Publishers,
620 Atlantic Ave., Boston, Mass.

Read the philosophers, and learn how to make life happy, seeking useful precepts and brave and noble words which may become deeds.—SENECA.

THE REIGN OF THE STOICS.

—THEIR—

History, Religion, Philosophy, and Maxims of Self-Control, Self-Culture, Benevolence, and Justice.

With Citations of Authors Quoted from on Each Page.

BY FREDERIC MAY HOLLAND.

OPINIONS OF THE PRESS.

This book shows that many Christians might learn much from these ancient heathen.—[American Bookseller.

One of the most valuable helps for those who would understand the character of human progress in all ages.—[National Quarterly Review.

The author has shown himself a diligent student, an ardent admirer, and a faithful interpreter, of some of the most remarkable monuments of ancient thinking.—[New York Tribune.

Lecky says of Marcus Aurelius: "The purest and gentlest spirit of all the pagan world." Merivale says: "Of all the line the noblest and dearest." Taine says: "The noblest soul that ever lived." John Stuart Mill says: "He preserved through life not only the most unblemished justice, but the tenderest heart."

Extra Cloth, 12mo, 248 pp., $1.25.

Address THE NEW IDEAL COMPANY,
620 Atlantic Ave., BOSTON.

Various Matters by Mr. West.

UPLIFTS OF HEART AND WILL: A Series of Religious Meditations, or Aspirations, addressed to Earnest Men and Women. *Cloth, square 18mo., beveled edges. Price, postpaid, 50 cents.*

"Finely named, and an inspiring book, though a most peculiar one. While it especially asserts that it is addressed to earnest men and woman, and to no deity, yet the worship of the ideal good breathes through every line. And the poems take one by the hand and lead him up; some of them are lofty and sublime."—*The Patrol.*

"On purely rational grounds it is not easy to meet the position [of this little book], except by saying that the words and forms of our [usual] devotion must be accepted as *frankly symbolic*, and *not amenable to the understanding.**** It is good to welcome a religious science better than the old hard bigotry. Still, while we by no means accept these 'Uplifts' as a necessary or an adequate substitute for the customary exercises of devotion, they are at least better fitted than the ordinary practice to a state of mind far from uncommon, and greatly deserving of respect."—*From a seven-page notice in the Unitarian Review.*

"A man of gifts and graces making an effort to get out of the old and worn-out way of petitioning for special things to a deity supposed to deal in special providences. Heartfelt and choicely worded, the book is the reaching out for more life and light of an earnest man."—*Religio-Philosophical Journal.*

VOICES OF YOUTH: "Holiday Idlesse, and other Poems." New Red-Line Edition. Illustrated. Printed on heavy paper, with extra wide margins. Handsomely bound in appropriately pictured covers illustrating the title-poem. *Large square 12mo, 252 pages. Price, postpaid,* $1.00.

"As works of art these poems stand among the most marked and promising of any which have been essayed by a youthful writer in this or the Old World. They are the creations of a true poet."—*Christian Leader.*

"The poems of Mr. West are more than entertaining, they are helpful. His grasp upon familiar objects, and a faculty of voicing poetic thought concerning them, give a real pleasure."—*Advocate.*

HYMNS LOOKING ONWARD, INWARD, UPWARD. "Valuable as a collection of untheological religious verse, even when not intended to be sung." *Single copies, postpaid, 10 cents. More than ten copies, 5 cents each.*

"A pamphlet of Forty-Two Hymns, collected and arranged by James H. West. Older collections of church hymns furnishing little that he could use consistently with modern rational religious thought, this thin pamphlet was printed for temporary use, to serve until something larger and better should be demanded by a growing consistency on the part of liberals as a whole. These hymns are of human hope and human endeavor, and are valuable as a collection of untheological religious verse, even when not intended to be sung."—*Index.*

See the advertisement of Single Pamphlet Discourses by Mr. West, in another place.

*** The above sent postpaid, on receipt of price, by THE NEW IDEAL COMPANY, Boston, Mass..

EVOLUTION OF THE EARTH: The story of Geology. **10 Cts.** New Ideal Pub. Co., Boston.

Single Discourses by Mr. West.

The Work of a True Church,.....6 cts.
The Complete Life (*sixth thousand*),...2 cts.
The Helper-On,.....6 cts.
Moral Purpose,.....6 cts.
"The Divine Satisfaction,".....5 cts.

The Five for 15 cents, or
Five copies of either (except the second), 15 cts.

Address The New Ideal Company.

SCIENTIFIC THEISM.

By FRANCIS ELLINGWOOD ABBOT, Ph. D.

12mo, cloth, 242 pages. $2.00.

*** The above sent postpaid, on receipt of price, by THE NEW IDEAL COMPANY, 620 Atlantic Ave., Boston.

TWENTIETH CENTURY

Devoted to Secular Religion and Social Regeneration.

HUGH O. PENTECOST, Editor.

Contains, besides crisp and pointed editorials and contributions from a corps of able writers, the Sunday Addresses of the Editor before Unity Congregation.

It is the only so-called "Liberal" paper that advocates radical social regeneration.

Its columns are open to the absolutely free discussion of all religious and economic theories.

Twelve pages. Issued weekly. Annual subscription, one dollar. *Sample Copies free. All subscribers will receive a Copy of Mr. Pentecost's book, "WHAT I BELIEVE."*

Address:

TWENTIETH CENTURY PUBLISHING CO.,

No. 4 WARREN STREET, NEW YORK CITY.

"Your little book is one of those I would like to have always with me." (Springfield, Mass.)

THE COMPLETE LIFE.

Six Discourses,

FROM THE STANDPOINT OF MODERN THOUGHT.

BY JAMES H. WEST,
AUTHOR OF "UPLIFTS OF HEART AND WILL," "VOICES OF YOUTH," ETC., ETC.

"This world—it means intensely, and means good; To find its meaning is my meat and drink."

The subjects of the discourses are:

The Complete Life, The Helper-On, Moral Purpose, The Deification of Man, Equilibrium, "The Holy Spirit."

[From WM. J. POTTER.]

"The little book did not arrive till yesterday,—delayed, as the *complete life* is apt to be. I have already dipped into it here and there with great satisfaction. I specially note that you emphasize as a vital practical reality the 'God-power' *in man.* That is my emphasis. And the thought greatens with me, not only as the basis of a sound religious philosophy, but as the central motive of a practical gospel."

[From *The Chicago Evening Journal.*]

"Would that all pulpits rang with words as brave and true as we find in the published sermon-lectures of James H. West, brought out in book form with the title 'The Complete Life.' Every word the author indites is golden, and should be read by young and old. Such books are genuine uplifts of heart and mind, and when we get to heaven, if we ever do, through earth's sordid dust and mire, we shall have men like James H. West to thank for finding our way there."

[From *The Christian Register.*]

"In all these discourses Mr. West shows a sympathy with Nature, a poetic and a spiritual sense of the divine forces that are working in Nature and in man. The moral tone is always earnest, and the moral ideal is high. They are sermons which bear on right thought and right living. The author finds in the natural the synonym of the divine. He finds a moral purpose budding and blooming in the nature of man."

Fine Cloth, Gilt Stamp, - 60 Cents.

*** The above sent postpaid, on receipt of price, by THE NEW IDEAL COMPANY, 620 Atlantic Ave., Boston.

ESSAYS

Religious, Social, Political

BY

DAVID ATWOOD WASSON

With a Biographical Sketch by
O. B. FROTHINGHAM.

Cloth, 12mo, pp. 393. Price, $2.50.